E 449
.044
Copy 1

TWO

LECTURES

ON THE SUBJECTS OF

SLAVERY

AND

ABOLITION.

☞ Compiled for the special use of Anti-Slavery Lecturers and Debaters. ☜

☞ And intended for Public Reading. ☜

Open thy mouth for the Dumb.....Plead the cause of the Poor and Needy.—Proverbs xxxi 8, 9.

And as he REASONED.....*Felix trembled, &c.*—Acts xxiv 25.

PROVE *all things;* hold fast that which is good.—1st Thessalonians, v 21.

BY CHARLES OLCOTT.

Massillon, Ohio.

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

1838.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Inability to comply with several invitations, to lecture on the subjects of Slavery and Abolition, united with a strong desire to contribute a share to the overthrow of Slavery, and the establishment of "equal rights" every where, suggested the project of *publishing* the arguments I have usually employed for those purposes, in the form of Lectures, intended for the *special* use of *Anti-Slavery Lecturers and Debaters*. Could I be instrumental in preparing, perhaps thousands of such agents, the sphere of my usefulness would, necessarily, be greatly enlarged. The cause requires the aid of Lecturers, qualified *at home*, in all parts of the country: I humbly hope that this effect will, to a considerable extent, be actually produced by the publication; and for that special purpose I recommend it to the public. For, notwithstanding the imperfections of the performance, if the arguments contained in it, and the references to sustain them, *be profoundly studied*, the proposed lecturer or debater may, I think, by adding thereto the arguments of others and the fruit of his own reflections, soon equip himself for the great moral combat now raging, in any circumstances, where intellectual skill is permitted fully to exert itself. Even without such preparations, simple reading of the Lectures will, in general, produce an excellent effect: for the arguments they contain can never be refuted to the satisfaction of any intelligent audience. And though individual hearers may not have sufficient candor to acknowledge their convictions, their conduct will testify that the arrow is fixed in their consciences, never to be withdrawn. Even infidel hearers will be converted, to at least *one* doctrine of Christianity; and no intelligent person will ever rise, from their attentive and candid perusal, without the strongest conviction of the truth and justice of anti-slavery principles and practice. It will have this effect, I presume, even on slaveholders. I feel fully warranted in making these declarations, from personal observation, of the effects of the mere reading of the Lectures, on mixed audiences of advocates and opposers of Abolition.

The reason of annexing *so many* Scripture references, was to give a full exhibition of the Spirit of the Scriptures, in relation to Human Oppression, and its opposite, Abolition. I have been long impressed with the truth and importance of Mrs. Child's opinion, that we ought never to trust to any thing but this *spirit*, (that is, the *general* and *collective* meaning of the Scriptures,) for the derivation of Christian doctrines and principles. I do not pretend the references are all *equally* pertinent to prove the various doctrines stated; but I think that a critical investigation will satisfy every candid reader, that most of them are peculiarly appropriate for the objects intended. And I have purposely omitted quoting the *words* of the references, in order to *compel* the readers to examine for themselves,--which they are earnestly requested to do.

The occasion, likewise afforded me an excellent opportunity for displaying the wonderful *purity* and *harmony* in doctrine of all parts of the Scriptures, in relation to the great doctrines treated of; this purity and harmony of those Books being to me a strong proof of their *Divine* origin. They exhibit the perfection of the *morality* of the Bible,--and how far they are from being *fully* developed in this publication, the use of a good Concordance and Polyglot Bible will soon discover. The complete harmony of the Scriptures, *in precept and example*, is also well deserving of further research: and much of such research will indeed be necessary, to the accomplished lecturer. I am sensible of the defects of the Lectures; and, though the embarrassments under which they were compiled may apologize for a *part* of those defects, I am fully aware that much profitable matter may be judiciously added to the work. This the lecturer may profitably do, by pasting slips of paper by the edges, between the leaves of the pamphlet

containing memoranda of additional arguments and references. And, with such assistance, I hope the Lectures will prove the most useful Vade Mecum to anti-slavery Lecturers and Debaters that has been published. They are written in the *plainest* style, which renders them easily intelligible to the smallest capacity. On no subject does there seem to be more ignorance and error in the United States, than upon that of human Rights, especially on their *origin* and inalienable nature. With a view, also, to enlighten and disabuse the public mind, in relation to these great and vital doctrines, this publication is issued. Those who receive copies are requested to circulate them into the possession of such persons as are willing and desirous to prepare themselves for lecturing and debating on the great subjects they treat of. And the holders of copies are respectfully requested, to take the trouble to sew stout covers on them, writing the title on the covers; for by so doing, they may be preserved for a long time.

It seems proper to add, that the expenses of the publication and its distribution, have been principally defrayed by the liberal contributions of abolitionists and others in Medina county, whose example will, I hope, be extensively and liberally followed.

C. O.

Medina, Ohio, July, 1837.

Lecture First.

SLAVERY.

THE object of the First of these Lectures is to prove, that Slavery is as great a crime against the Law of God, as murder, or any other crime; and that it is, also, a great crime against the Common Law. The object of the Second Lecture is to prove, that the immediate abolition of Slavery, is not only a just and righteous measure, but is at all times, and under all circumstances, perfectly safe and greatly beneficial to all persons or parties concerned or interested therein, and that *it* is the *only* kind of safe Abolition.

It has been truly said, that "to reach the heart we must begin at the head"—that is, to enlist the sympathies, engage the affections, and command the will, we must first convince the understanding. In order to convert we must first convict. This is, also, the true Scriptural method—vide Luke ii. 46, Acts ix. 22, xviii. 28, xxiv. 25. With the sole view to produce this happy result, the following Lectures will consist almost entirely of a series of *arguments*.

By way of introduction to the main subject of this lecture, which is to prove that Slavery is a great *Sin*, I will remark, that we may readily know Slavery to be a great crime or sin, because nothing *but crimes* can support the practice of it. No person can support slavish oppression ten minutes without breaking the moral law. A man cannot stir, or move, or begin to act, either in support of slavery, or in opposition to its immediate abolition, without committing crimes or sins of some sort or other. If he does not proceed to the use of open violence and illegal force for that purpose, he is yet compelled to resort to falsehood, sophistry and slander; to either the one or the other, even if he does nothing at all, he is guilty of a criminal silence, which is a great *sin of omission*. And, according to the Scriptures, sins of *omission*, or the breach of positive commands, are as great as those of commission, or the breach of negative commands—vide Exodus xxi, 29, Deut. xxviii 15, 63, Prov. i, 24, 25, Isaiah lvi 10, 11, Matt. xxv, 24, 29, Heb. ii, 3, xii, 25, and a hundred other passages equally plain. Many affect to be *neutral* in the great abolition contest; but the Scriptures inform us there is no such thing as *neutrality* in such a contest—vide Matthew xii, 30. It is also easy to show, as I shall soon attempt to, that slavery has from first to last, been supported directly and solely *by crimes*, and that the commission of nearly every crime in the Bible calendar, and many crimes against the common law, are *absolutely necessary* to support it and give it full effect. It is a fact equally curious and true, as any one may be convinced by reflection, that crime of any kind can only be supported *by* crime; and that in order to persevere in the commission of one crime, and prevent its detection and punishment, it is necessary to commit still further crimes. To know, then, whether a practice is *sinful* or not, we have usually only to enquire, whether crimes are necessary for its support; and where a practice like slavery, requires the aid of *all* other crimes for its necessary support, we may be certain that it is one of the worst of crimes and greatest

of sins. In the pungent language of John Wesley, it must be "the execrable sum of all villanies."

Slavery is declared by its enemies to be a *sin*. In order then to understand its true nature clearly, we must determine in the first place what *Sin is*. Sin is defined, in the Scriptures, to be a 'transgression or breach of law.'—vide 1st John iii, 4. *Law* must, therefore, first exist *to be* broken, otherwise sin cannot exist. For as the apostle Paul justly argues, 'where no law is there is no transgression,' or sin—vide Rom. iv, 15, iii, 20.

When a law of any description is broken, it is said to be *sinned* against. The breach of *any good* law, whether Divine or human, always incurs moral if not legal guilt. The breach of the Law of God, as it is called, incurs the highest moral guilt of which intelligent beings are capable. As the law of a country is the *will* of its legislature, so the Law of God is the *will* of God revealed to his intelligent creatures; which they are under the highest of obligations to obey, and for the least breach of which men are accountable,—vide Deut. xxvii, 6, Matt. v, 18, James ii 10. I propose now to show that human slavery is one of the greatest of sins or transgressions of the Law of God, incurs the highest consequent guilt, and subjects the transgressor to the heaviest Divine retribution.

The Law of God is discovered from TWO sources—His Word and His Works. The former is sometimes called the *revealed* or *written* Law of God, or *Law of Revelation;* the other is called the *unwritten* Law of God, or *Law of Nature.* The Law of Revelation, is that great collection of commands, precepts and examples, given by God to man, by *express* revelation, as rules for his religious and moral conduct. It is contained in the Bible, the various books composing which are authenticated as the word of God, by far better evidence than any other ancient books whatever. The Law of Nature is wholly discovered in the phenomena of nature, animate and inanimate, around us. The perfect harmony of these two great laws, shows the identity of their origin; and their perfect excellence is tested by their invariable tendency, *when obeyed*, to produce perfect happiness. These *two* make in reality, but one law, called the *Law of God.* Against this Law thus discovered, Human Slavery is one of the greatest of crimes. To show this fact clearly, it is necessary to define Slavery itself. To understand the nature and tendency of Slavery, we must understand the *system* or *principle* of it.

Slavery has two definitions, the *direct* and *indirect*. The first, or *direct*, definition is, THE TOTAL DEPRIVATION OF ALL HUMAN RIGHTS. The other, or *indirect*, definition is, THE REDUCING OF HUMAN BEINGS TO THE CONDITION OF BRUTES, who have no rights, or, THE MAKING OF HUMAN BEINGS TO BECOME PROPERTY, as goods and chattels, transferable as articles of merchandise. Either definition will answer for the purposes of argument, though the first or direct definition is to be preferred. But to understand this definition clearly, it is also necessary to define Human Rights.

A *Right* is defined to be, a privilege or liberty of doing, being, possessing, using, or suffering something, without the interference, molestation, or hindrance of our fellow men. Thus, for example, there is the Right *to be* secure in our persons, called the right of *Personal Security;* the Right *to go*, or travel and return, when, where, and as we please, called the right of *Personal Liberty;* and the Right *to have*, procure, possess, enjoy and dispose of, as our own exclusively, all sorts of material objects or substances, except each other, called the right of *Private Property.* These are the *three* great, absolute, natural Rights, of which all the rest are mere auxiliaries or appendages. And these, I say, are the gift of God *to every human being*, plainly granted to him, both in the Law of Revelation and in the Law of Nature; or by the express and implied will of God. The word '*right*,' applied in its modern sense, as the gift of the Almighty to his intelligent creatures, is not often used in the Bible; yet sufficiently often to prove the proposition *directly*, that Rights are the gift of God, to all the human species,—Deut. xxi, 17, Ruth ii, 20, iv, 6, 1st Kings viii, 45, 2d Chron. vi, 35, 39, Job xxxiv, 6, 17, xxxvi, 6, Ps. ix, 4, xvii, 1, cxl, 12, Prov. xvi, 8, Isaiah x, 2, Jer. v, 28, xvii, 11, xxxii, 7, 8; Lam. iii, 35; Eze. xxii 29, Amos v 12, Mal. iii 5; and several other passages. But the easiest and plainest method of demonstrating, that the Law of Revelation grants and guarantees, the natural and all other just rights to all mankind, is by showing *indirectly*, that the various *Duties* enjoined on us in the Scriptures, cannot be properly performed at all, without the complete

possession and enjoyment of these Rights. The *gift* will thus appear, from express revelation, by *necessary implication*. It is well observed by Dr. Channing, that Duties and Rights are *reciprocal*; that is, whatever it is made our *Duty* to do, we have, and must have, a corresponding *Right* to do; and vice versa, whatever we have a *Right* to do, it must be our *Duty* to do. Common sense intuitively perceives the truth of this great maxim. It would be the highest impiety and absurdity to believe that our Creator has issued contradictory commands; or that He has enjoined *duties* on us, the performance of which He intended to be impossible, nugatory and vain, that we should have *no right* to perform. God never does any thing in vain,—vide Ps. cxi 7, Isa. xlv 18, li 6, lv 11, Jer. xxxi 35, 36, Eze. vi 10, Matt. x 20, xxiv 35, Luke xii 6, Rom. ii 2, iv 16, 2d Tim. ii 19, and various other passages. God is, also, no respecter of persons,—vide Deut. i 17, xvi 19, 2d Sam. xiv 14, 2d Chron. xix 7, Job xxxiv 19, Prov. xxiv 23, xxviii 21, Acts x 34. Rom. ii 11, Gal. ii 6, Eph. vi 9, Col. iii 25, 1st Pet. i 17, James ii 1, 9. He has made it our Duty to obey *all* his commands,—vide Deut. xxvii 26, xxviii 1, Ps. cxix 96, Jer. xi 3, 4, Matt. v 18, 19, Luke xvi 17, Gal. iii 10, James ii 10, 1st Pet. i 25. It follows therefore, of course, that we have a corresponding *Right* to obey them all, to their full extent and spirit, and to the use of all the means necessary to enable us to obey them, the natural Rights with the rest. And as the Scriptures make no exception of any part of mankind, expressly declaring that 'God is no respecter of persons, (vide ante.) it follows clearly that He has given all these rights to all human beings equally, as their inheritance or property, and that they cannot, therefore, be taken from them *without* crime, except upon forfeiture *by* crime; otherwise all the Bible commands might be rendered ineffectual and vain, by *lawful* human agency, which is absurd: for if men can have a *right* to enslave each other, they must necessarily have a *right* to prohibit each other from obeying the commands of God, which is most absurd. The rights of men would *lawfully* conflict with obedience to the laws of God, which is an impious supposition. It would give to man the *right* to annul the law of God, (as all slaveholders do) which is a most impious absurdity.

All the natural rights being necessary to enable mankind to obey the commands of God, they are thus clearly demonstrated, to be His gift to all mankind. This gift is one of His unalterable laws, and no man or body of men can lawfully infringe it, except as a punishment for the commission of crime, which exception is made by the Law of God itself. Thus is it demonstrated in the clearest manner, that all men have a *right* vested in them by their Creator, to obey all his commands. And if any of the laws or customs of men, directly or indirectly, prohibit or infringe this right, they are in the sight of God null and void. The holy prophets and apostles and other saints, uniformly treated them as such,—vide Ex. i 17, Josh. xxiv 15, 1st Kings xviii 21, Est. iii 2, 5, Dan. iii 4, 5, 12, 16, 17, vi 7, 10, 13, Matt. vi 24, Acts iv 19, v 29, and other passages. Such blasphemous laws and customs, are an impious interference with the prerogatives and supremacy of Jehovah. God alone can lawfully *own* mankind—vide Eze. xviii 4. The holy martyrs were all persecuted for breaches of such laws. Had they disobeyed the laws of God, by yielding obedience to them, their lives and safety would have been secured. As particular statutes of a State, made in opposition to its constitution, are void, so all human laws and customs, and constitutions, made in derogation of the Law of God, are in His sight utterly vain, and without any moral obligation. For this reason it is the abolitionists have proclaimed, that *before God* all the laws and customs of slavery are NULL AND VOID. They are valid only in the corrupt sentiment of wicked, impious men, as all other wicked laws only are. They have no moral or religious obligation whatever, their only binding authority being wicked force and violence; or, as it is sometimes called, 'the right of the strongest,' whose 'might makes their right' only, which is always an eternal wrong. The wicked laws and customs of tyrants, pirates, robbers, heathens and savages, have no other or greater validity.—An unjust wicked law or custom, introduced to legalize crimes, is itself a wrong, crime or sin, and instead of justifying acts done by its authority, before God, increases their moral guilt and responsibility. Such corrupt laws and customs are *national* sins, and merit national punishment. *Union* in wickedness or community in crime is excessively sinful—vide Ps. xxxiii 3, 5, Prov. i 10, 16, Isa. xxviii 18, Jer. v 25, 29, xi, 19, 20, Eze. xxx 6, xxxv, 15, Oba. 10, 15, and many other passages.

Human slavery, directly or indirectly, interferes with, disturbs, hinders, interrupts or prohibits, the performance of *every one* of the duties enjoined on mankind by the express commands of the Almighty. If any one, who well understands the nature and operation of slavery, doubts the truth of this surprising declaration, let him take up the Bible, examine the long list of the Divine commands and precepts contained in that Book, and reflect if it be possible for slaves, fettered, cramped and ignorant as they are, to obey *one* of these commands in its full spirit & extent. I say they cannot; and that every candid person may be convinced of the awful fact, by a candid and careful examination. Let any such person ask himself for instance, how it is possible for any *slave* to obey the commands contained in the following passages, either in their letter or spirit—Rom. xii 19, Eph. v 2, 3, 4, 22, 25, vi 1, 4, 9, 2d Pet. ii 12, 17, 18, 23, iii 1, 8, 9. These are referred to merely as specimens. Surely no *slave* can practice any of these commands at all, in the spirit of their requirements; not only for want of free agency, but on account of the manifold temptations and provocations, by which he is beset, and at all times surrounded. Special grace must be necessary to enable a slave to obey any of these commands. The most perfect free agency is necessary, to enable the subjects of God's commands, to yield perfect obedience to them. The candid inquirer will also recollect, that slaves are purposely kept in the greatest possible *ignorance* of the Bible and its contents; they could not be kept as slaves, if they were not; and that their natural passions and appetites seldom receive any voluntary check or control. Temporal bondage *necessarily* produces spiritual slavery. It must be near a miracle for slaves to obey any Divine commands. Under such circumstances, there can be no doubt but God will 'wink at' the sins of the poor slaves; but their wretched *masters* cannot reasonably expect any thing else but 'a certain fearful looking for,'—vide Prov. xxiv 1, Luke xii 47, 48, Heb. x 27, &c.

Let us illustrate the case, by a few more examples. Honor and reverence to parents is a plain Divine command, obligatory on all the children in the world—(vide ante.)—So is the protection and instruction of their children, on all parents—vide Prov. xxii 6, Eph. vi 4 1st Tim. v 8, 2d Tim. iii 14, 15. Now as neither slave parents nor children have any rights at all, they being merely goods and chattels, it is impossible they should obey these positive injunctions. According to the laws and customs of slavery, slave parents have no rights or duties at all, over or in relation to their children; nor have the children any rights or duties in relation to their parents—and they, accordingly, seldom exercise, or attempt to exercise, any such rights or duties. They are usually sold and separated from each other forever. So husbands and wives are positively commanded to live and cohabit together, and discharge all the duties of that endearing relation—vide 1st Cor. vii 3, 5. But slavery wholly forbids the *right* and practice of marriage to the slaves, and compels them as it were, to break the law of God, by living in unlawful and frequently promiscuous concubinage,—vide 1st Cor. vi 18, and several other passages of similar import. So the duties of citizens, neighbors, friends, &c. are all positively enjoined,—vide Ex. xx 16, Lev. xix 13, 15, 18, Luke x 29, 37, Rom. xii 10, 13, 20, xiii 10. xv 2, Eph. ii 19. But slaves have none of the *rights* attending these relations. It has been solemnly and repeatedly decided, by the highest judicial authority, in the slave states, that slaves are mere 'goods and chattels,' (vide Stroud); and their treatment in all respects, so far as it is possible to reduce humanity to that condition, corresponds in those states, with these infamous decisions. Nor, situated as they are, could they fulfil these duties, even if they had the nominal right to. In the eye of slave laws and customs, they have no rights at all, any more than beasts; and these have no rights or duties prescribed by any law. How then can they practice duties to which they have *no right*? 'Search the Scriptures,' (vide John v 39, and other passages,) is another plain command, obligatory on all mankind. But slavery utterly prohibits the slaves from obeying it. No slave is permitted to learn to read, under the severest penalties; nor is any one permitted to instruct him in reading, under similar penalties—vide Stroud's Sketch. Let one example more suffice. We are positively commanded to 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good—vide 1st Thess. v 21. Now it is impossible for any man to obey this command, either in its letter or spirit, unless he has the possession and use of all his natural rights, Personal Security, Personal Liberty and Private Property, in their fullest extent; that is, unless he is a free moral agent. Slavery, therefore, effectually prohibits the slaves

from obeying it at all Such criminal prohibitions of positive christian duties, are among the greatest of sins against the law of God—vide Ex. iii 9, v 6, 7, vi 5, 6, Deut. xxiv 4, Ps. xciv 20, Isa. iii 12—15, v 18, 20, ix 16, 17, x 1, xix 14, Luke xi 57, 1st Tim. iv 3, and many other passages.

As has been said, it has been repeatedly decided, by the highest judicial authorities in the slave states, that slaves are, to *all* intents, constructions and purposes, goods and chattels personal, and that they cannot own, possess, or acquire any thing, but what belongs to their owners, (vide Stroud) ; thus placing them on a level with *brutes*. This is the highest judicial blasphemy and impiety ; but see the effect of it. Goods and chattels have no rights ; therefore slaves have none, not even to worship their Maker and obey his commands! One would hope in a republican country, to find moral integrity on the judicial bench. But so completely has slavish corruption poisoned every part of society in the slave states, that the Bench and the Bar are fully contaminated. Justice *to slaves* is a solemn mockery in those States.

I will candidly admit, that some few slaves who have what are called *humane* masters, are allowed some few poor scanty privileges, which they enjoy, not from the license and protection of the law, but from the sufferance and humanity of their masters. For no master is *obliged* by law to allow his slaves any privileges, any more than he is his horses and cattle ; and in fact most of them do not allow their slaves as many. The few laws made for the prevention of excessive slave cruelties are seldom enforced in practice ; the tyrants taking care to perpetrate such cruelties only in the sight of slaves, who have no right to testify against them. These laws are for the most part, practically, a dead letter. Such also is the fear of the power and malice of the tyrants, that none dare enforce them, even if they have the opportunity and proof.

As might be expected from such a state of things, the general treatment of most slaves is cruel and barbarous in the extreme, as has been proven a thousand times over. 'Cruelty' says an eye witness, 'is almost invariably the rule, and kindness the exception.' This cruelty extends to every particular of their treatment ; cruelty in their food and clothing ; cruelty in their lodging and habitations ; cruelty in their labor and rest ; cruelty in their punishments and sufferings ; cruelty in their deprivation of liberty ; cruelty in their deprivation of all literary knowledge, especially the knowledge of their duty ; cruelty in their sale and separation from each other ; cruelty in their deprivation of all comfort and hope ; cruelty in every thing relating to the practice of slavery. It is all a complicated mass of constant, remorseless, unpitying cruelty. It is unnecessary to detail particular cases of cruelty, to illustrate a case so plain and well known. Slavery is more bloody, cruel and barbarous in christian America, than it was in heathen Greece and Rome, as a comparison of the slave customs and practice of the three countries will prove. We are frequently shocked at the recital of barbarian cruelties. But none such ever equalled the habitual cruelties of American *republican, christian* slavery !

The whole system of slavery is a system of constant, *necessary* cruelty ; for without the use of constant cruelty it could not exist. Nothing can be more repugnant to the whole spirit and genius of the Law of God, than this whole infernal system is,—vide Ex. xxii 21, xxiii 9 Lev. xix 13, Judg. x 11, 12, Job xxvii 13, &c., Ps. lxxii 4, Isa. xiv 2, xix 20, Mic. ii 1—3, Zech. vii 9—14, Mal. ii 5, iii 5, and a thousand other passages of Scripture. The Bible overflows as it were, with denunciations of the sin of Human Oppression, and with threats of its severest punishment. Scarcely a page of the Sacred Volume can be turned, but what contains something condemnatory of this great sin. This repetition of denunciation was doubtless intentional, because men who from their circumstances in life have the power, are so very apt to commit it.

Nor is the necessary tendency of slavery less destructive to the morals and happiness of the masters, than to those of the slaves. The support of slavery renders crime *necessary*.—Besides, the *power* which slavery confers on the masters, constantly exposes them to vicious temptations. The propriety of Agur's requests, (vide Prov. xxx 8, &c.,) and the Scriptural precepts respecting *temptations*, (vide Matt. vi 13, 1st Cor. x 13, 2d Pet. ii 9, &c.,) were never more *strongly* exemplified, than by the *necessary* tendency of slavery on slave masters. Slave hold-

ers are the most vicious people in the world. Their moral sense is so blunted and their consciences so 'seared' and hardened, that they distort and pervert every good precept and practice, to support their habitual indulgence in crime. Most sins that with other men are occasional, are with them habitual. It would seem as if there was no vice from which they are exempt. These awful results are the fruit of the habitual and *necessary* cruelty and other vices of slavery. It is *impossible* that slaveholders should be otherwise than habitually and incorrigibly vicious and criminal. A person would be as likely to grow up with virtuous habits in a brothel, as on a slave plantation or in a slave neighborhood, vide Prov. vi 27, 28.

Slavery makes all men engaged in the practice of it cruel towards each other. It is the parent of proud cruel tempers and dispositions. Slaveholders are in general, excessively hard hearted towards poor whites, whether strangers or neighbors. Slave captains are frequently monsters of cruelty. The ferocious treatment slaveholders frequently manifest towards each other, is the genuine fruit of slavery. Their boasted hospitality is nothing but ostentatious liberality, exhibited to gratify their vanity and pride. Their pretended piety is wholly fictitious, being nothing but the 'form of godliness' without the reality--vide 2d Tim. iii 5. Like other aristocrats, they have no 'bowels of compassion' for the poor, no anxiety for the welfare of any but aristocrats like themselves; and so far as their power extends, they oppress all below them in the scale of society, whether slaves or freemen. Perhaps men are prone to commit no sin with greater *certainty*, than the oppression of each other. We see this tendency exhibited every where in every state of society. Men love to live in ease and splendor on each others earnings. Hence the origin of monopolies, speculation, high rents, usury, and the other innumerable means used to 'grind the faces of the poor' and extort their services, for the least possible compensation. These facts show that *colour* has no relation to slavish oppression. Men oppress each other in all cases, without reference to it, so far as they have the *power*. This is the reason why the Bible always takes sides with the poor against their oppressors, denouncing the severest punishments against the latter.

It has been said that it is impossible slave cruelties should be so great as is pretended, because the slaves *increase* so much faster than their white neighbors. But in their relative circumstances, the two facts are perfectly consistent with each other. The cause of this superiority of increase is, that the slaves are *healthier* than their masters. Indolence and dissipation enervate the slaveholders, and greatly retard their natural increase. Idleness, dissipation and debauchery prematurely destroy the masters, as cruelty does the slaves. Yet the latter are so much healthier than the former that they increase much faster; so much so, that they must in a few years become the most numerous class. But owing to the foregoing causes, both races in the slave states increase much slower than their northern brethren.

Such being the invariable effects of slavery, it may not be amiss to give a passing notice to the base pretence so frequently made, of the *happiness* and *contentment* of slaves! Nothing but the peculiar hardihood in crime produced by the practice of slavery would ever have forged this falsehood, contradicted as it is by every species of evidence both of friends and foes. Yet it is frequently uttered while the newspapers are crowded with advertisements of runaway slaves, and while such is the dread of slave insurrections, helpless as the slaves are, that the slaveholders live in constant fear of them, sleeping with loaded arms at their bed posts, while guards and patrols are scouring the country in all directions. Such guilty fears of deserved retribution are the just punishment of all tyrants. Each plantation is carefully watched, and the severest regulations every where adopted to prevent the slaves from leaving the plantations, and the most terrible punishments inflicted for any breach of them. Runaways are punished with the most horrid cruelties; notwithstanding which they sometimes escape, or prefer death to the iron bondage they are doomed to suffer on their return. Upwards of ten thousand have escaped to Canada through every danger and extremety of suffering. In the West Indies, several thousands have attempted to escape from the slave to the free islands, the majority of whom perished in the waves. With such evidence to the contrary and masses more that might be adduced, nothing I say but the peculiar hardihood in sin produced by slavery, could ever have set up and supported this lying pretence.

But if the pretence be true, what becomes of the pretence of danger from Abolition!

Will the slaves love their masters any the less after abolition than they did *before!* Or will abolition change their natures, and convert them from friends into foes to their former owners? will they become so enraged at the *evils* of emancipation, as contrasted with the 'happiness' and benefits of slavery, as to turn round and destroy their old slave benefactors! Let those who are acquainted with the effects of all past slave emancipations answer these inquiries.

It is customary with the advocates of slavery and the opposers of abolition when pressed in argument, to fly from one 'refuge of lies' to another, (a great sin; vide Isa. xxviii 15--17,); and the last criminal 'refuge' to which they all resort for the most criminal of all purposes, (the justification of crime,) is the *perversion* of a few texts extracted from the Old and New Testaments, (Gen. xii 5, xiv 14, xvii 12, 13, 23, 27, Ex. xxi 6, 21, Lev. xxv 44--46, Eph. vi 5, 1tt Tim. vi 1, and a few others), which they contend, justify the highest degree of Human Oppression which man is capable of inflicting on his fellow man, *slavery!* They pretend that *God himself* did in some cases establish slavery by law over innocent persons, and has thereby justified the practice in the United States and other Slave countries; thus making the Almighty the author of a practice that annuls all rights whatever, even that of obeying His own commands! They assert that a practice which requires for its necessary support, the aid of almost every other crime denounced in the Scriptures, and which is declared by the general consent of civilized nations to be *piracy* when exercised on the high seas, is a *Divine* institution expressly enacted in the Law of God! This pretence was first set up by christian professors, and the conduct of such professors has thrown more discredit on christianity, than all the *arguments* that have ever been used against it. And were the pretence true, it would make more skeptics and infidels than all other means put together. Yet there are great bodies of professing christians who pretend to believe in such blasphemy.

But as I have elsewhere shown that slavery prohibits obedience to all the Divine commands, it necessarily follows, that such a construction of the texts refered to as makes them support the abomination, must be a base perversion of their true meaning; or else the word of God contradicts and nullifies itself! vide Rom. vii, 7,—ix, 14. It is impious to suppose that the Almighty would nullify His own laws; that is, that He would make one law to contradict another, vide Numb. xxxii, 23,—Ps. xix, 7,—cxi, 7. As slavery necessarily requires and produces the commission of all other crimes, God would never have indirectly licensed them, at the same time that He directly forbade them by law. It is a universal rule of construction, that each part of a code of laws shall be so construed wherever construction is necessary, as to coincide with the spirit and meaning, if not with the letter, of all the other parts; vide 1 Blac Com. 61, 89. Such a construction of those texts therefore, as makes them contradict and render vain and ineffectual all the other rules of the Law of God, and outrage the whole spirit, reason and genius of the rest of the Bible, must be of course a base and blasphemous perversion, and those who have forged it must have wholly neglected all sound rules of construction, as well as the whole spirit of the Scriptures.

Let us give these perverted texts a *critical* examination and comparison with the rest of the Scriptures, in order if possible to discover their true meaning. It would be premature to say there is *no need* of construction in these cases, because the translation is perfect and the words are too plain to admit of construction. The persons described in some of the disputed texts as being in servitude are called (by mistranslation) *'bond servants', 'bond men', 'bond-maids', &c.* Now as all servants are not slaves or personal property, it by no means follows, that because they are said to be *'bond'* or *bound*, that they were slaves, because in some sense and degree all servants whatever are *bound*. Nor does it necessarily follow that because some of them were *'bought with money'*, that they were bought of third persons without their own consent as all real slaves are. It is also another general rule of construction, (vide 1 Blac. Com. 60,) that where a part of a law is dubious in its meaning, the judges shall compare it with the *context* or other parts of the law, or with other laws of the same nature or made for the same purposes. Such a comparison fairly made in the present case, easily removes all the seeming repugnancy and difficulty attending it.

It is well known that as the same words and phrases in the same language frequently have different meanings, so the same words and phrases in different languages have different mean-

ngs; and also that the meaning of the same words in the same language frequently alters with the lapse of time. Nothing is more common than such differences and alterations, as all linguists and classical scholars well know. Thus the phrase *'bought'* or *'bond-servants'* may have a very different meaning in the ancient Hebrew and modern English languages, corresponding with the different customs and usages of the two countries; or even a different meaning and legal effect in ancient Israel and the heathen nations by which they were surrounded. It is easy to discover the *degree* of the servitude to which the 'bond' servants of any country are subjected, by studying the *treatment* prescribed for them by the *laws* of the country, such laws being a transcript of the national will. If this treatment be slavish as in the slave states of this country, the presumption is they are slaves; if otherwise, the presumption is they are ordinary servants. Thus the modes, objects and effects of the purchases and sales of *men*, (Gen. xvii 12, Lev. xxv 44,) may have been very different in all these different countries, in ancient Israel and modern America for instance. 'Bond servants' *may be* slaves. But we have no reason to suppose those in ancient Israel were slaves, because *'bond service'* is described in the context as a species of *tribute*—vide 1st Kings ix 20—22, 2d Chron. viii 7, 8, 9, Ezra ix 9. These passages and many others that may be cited, prove, that the *'bond servants'* spoken of in the disputed texts might have been tenants or tributaries, but not personal property or 'goods and chattels personal' as the perversions maintain. Besides, the regulations made for the *treatment* of these 'bond servants', show that they could not have been slaves in any sense. A mass of other similar comparisons may be made to the same effect. And the friends of the equality of Human Rights, unwilling to construe the Law of God in such a manner as to make it contradict itself, and render its operation nugatory and vain, declare, that whatever the effect of the practice of buying and selling *men* among the Hebrews was, it could not have been *such* an effect as that produced by American Slavery. They declare such a perverse construction to be open blasphemy.

We are ourselves familiar by report, with certain transactions, *called* in common parlance, sales of *men*. It is a common practice *to sell* (as it is said) poor foreigners to pay their passage money. This is done by the passengers themselves, who being too poor to pay money, agree with the ship owners to sell or contract their time and labor on their arrival in this country, for a sum sufficient to pay their passage money. So paupers are sometimes said to be *sold* to the lowest bidder, that is, their support and maintenance are sold. So venal politicians are sometimes reproachfully said *to sell* themselves; that is, to sell their votes and influence. In these cases nobody supposes the persons mentioned to be sold by third persons as 'goods and chattels', *as slaves*. The sales are not in reality of men though so called, but of labor, maintenance and influence, and generally for humane, just and good purposes. A critical comparison of the disputed texts with the context also shows, that the sales of men mentioned therein were for similar purposes, and were attended with a similar effect.

We frequently read of purchases and sales and redemptions of people in the Scriptures, which from the nature of their *objects* could not have been of slaves,—vide Gen. xxix 15—29, xxiv 11, 12, Ex. xxi 7—11, xxii 17, xxxiv 20, Lev. xxvii 2—8, Numb. xviii 15, 16, Deut. xxii 28, 29, Judg. i 12, 13, Ruth iv 10, 1st Sam. xviii 25, 26, 27, Hos. iii 2. Purchases of *wives* and redemptions of *children* and other persons were customary among the Hebrews. And in none of the passages quoted or in the context, is there any proof that the persons 'bought' or 'redeemed' were bargained for as slaves. The wives and children of the Hebrews were not slaves in any sense whatever. Nor is there any more proof from the Scriptures that the Hebrew *servants* were slaves, than that their wives and children were. The Bible evidence is as I shall show, all directly the other way.

On looking into the Sacred context, we find there were TWO *modes* or ways, of buying and selling men; the one *voluntary* made by the persons bought and sold themselves, and approved of in the Scriptures; vide Gen. xlvii 19, 23, and other passages; and to which practice frequent reference is made in the Scriptures, to illustrate different subjects; vide 1st Kings xxi 20, 25, 2d Kings xvii 17, Isa. l 1, lii 3, Matt. vi 24, John viii 34, Rom. vi 13, 16, 17, 18, 2d Pet. ii 19. The general *treatment* prescribed for poor Hebrews sold for their poverty, (vide Ex. xxi 2, Lev. xxv 39, Deut. xv 12,) shows that their sales must have been voluntary,

because they themselves were to receive *wages* or pay for their services. Compare those passages, Lev. xxv 40, 49—53, Deut. xv 11—14, xxiv 14, 15, Jer xxii 13, Mal. iii 5. Slaves never receive wages, because they have *no right* to them. The texts here quoted, clearly show that the *sales* they mention must have been voluntary as well as limited. *This fact is also clearly established.*

The other kind of human sales and purchases was *involuntary* like that of our slave trade, made without the consent and against the will of the person sold, he himself being a party to the bargain nor receiving any part of the reward or equivalent,—vide Gen. xxxvii 27, 28, 36, xxxix 1. This is represented as a great crime and therefore obnoxious to sore punishment, vide Gen. xlii 21, 22. This must have been the crime of *'manstealing'* punished by the Law of God with sure death, (Ex. xxi 16,), a rule recognized and approbated in the New Testament, (1st. Tim. i 10,), from the *nature* of this crime. For almost the only object of *stealing* or kidnapping men is to enslave them or sell them to be enslaved; for usually nobody will buy one man from another except to enslave the man sold. And the expression *"found in his hand"* proves that *slaveholding* is just as criminal as slavetrading or kidnapping. It is only a continued permanent exercise of the crime of 'man-stealing'. In the case cited it is expressly called *stealing;* compare Gen. xxxvii 27, 28, 36, xl 15, and Ex. xxi 16. And the punishment of this crime being by the Law of God *the same* as the punishment of murder, (Deut xxxv 30,) shows that in the sight of God it is a crime of *equal enormity;* or, as great a crime as murder. And the fact that the rule is approbated in the New Testament, proves that it is as heinous a crime now as it was at first. For we must remember, that Christ came not to abrogate, but to fulfil and confirm the moral law in the strongest manner,—vide Matt. v 17, 18, 19, Luke xvi 17, Rom. iii 31, Gal. iii 24, 1st Pet. i 25. Nor is it any objection to this course of reasoning, that the *civil* penalties annexed to breaches of the moral lawin the Levitical code, were repealed by the dispensation of Christ. Christ is the 'end of the law for *righteousness*' only, (vide Matt. v 17, 18, 19, Rom. x 4, Gal. iii 24), but not for guilt. Under the christian dispensation, the *temporal* penalties annexed to breaches of the Divine law, ought to be inflicted by the temporal magistrate,—vide Rom. xiii 1—5, Tit. iii 1, 1st Pet. ii 14, and other passages. The *spiritual* or Divine penalties willl be inflicted as before, both now and hereafter,—vide Matt. v 18, 19, 20, Luke xvi 17, James ii 19, 1st Pet. i 25, and other passages. *These facts are also clearly established.*

The question now is, under which of these two modes of sales of human beings, did the Almighty permit the purchases of the heathen *"bond-men"* and *"bond-maids"* as they are falsely translated, (Lev. xxv 44—46,); the righteous, humane and equitable *voluntary* mode which He expressly enacted for His own people, (and He is no respecter of persons; vide ante; and has enjoined on us not to respect them—vide Ex. xxiii 2, 3, Lev. xix 15, Deut. i 17, xvi 19, Ps. lxxxii 2, Prov. xxiv 23, James ii 9,), or, the oppressive wicked *involuntary* mode which he punished with *sure death!* I do not put this question as though there could be any doubt in the mind of any honest unprejudiced person; but to all slaveholders and other corruptionists who would be esteemed *reasonable* men. For it is another universal general rule of construction, that all constructions shall be *reasonable* and agreeable to plain justice and equity,—vide 1 Blac. Com. 60, 61. Now when we know that *a part* of the Hebrew Servitudes approved by their Almighty Author were of the voluntary kind, and we do not know that the remainder (with one exception) were of any other kind, it is certainly *reasonable* to suppose, that with this exception they were all voluntary. The only one of these Servitudes that we *know* to be involuntary, was that of the thief sold to make restitution. —vide Ex. xxii 2, 3. And this very case being for crime, affords a strong presumption, that the others being without crime, were all of the voluntary kind; for God never deals with the innocent as with the guilty. No honest man, certainly no reasonable man can hesitate to adopt this doctrine. And it certainly does seem as if none but a very corrupt or very ignorant person could believe otherwise.

As Mr. Rankin justly observes, this construction 'is in accordance with the laws made for the protection of *strangers*',—vide Ex. xxii 21, Lev. xix 33, 34, xxv 35, Deut. i 16, x 18, 19, xxiv 14, 15, 17, and many other passages, where the Israelites are expressly forbidden under the heaviest penalties, to *"vex or oppress"* strangers; and are also commanded to love them.—

"Nothing" says Mr. Rankin, "could be a more direct violation of these statutes, than the practice of such slavery as exists in our slaveholding states. Nothing could *more* 'vex and oppress' the stranger than such bondage." By these statutes "to defraud the stranger of a single day's labor [wages] is set down as a grievous sin; how much *more* grievous, si the sin of taking from him both his liberty and labor for life!" This reasoning seems conclusive and unanswerable; and he who is not convicted by it of the sinfulness of slavery, ought to fear that he is incapable of moral conviction,—vide Rom. i 28, 1st Tim. iv 2, 2d Tim. iii 7, 8, Tit. i 15, 16.

But there is yet abundant additional proof that the Hebrew servants could not have been slaves, on account of the extraordinary legal *rights* and privileges they enjoyed; for slaves we should remember have no rights or privileges whatever. The Hebrew servants 'bought with money' were circumcised as adopted sons, Gen. xvii 12, 13, 23, 27, Ex. xii 43--48. They had the right of covenant with God, Deut. xxix 10, 13. They had the same right to the passover as the other Israelites; though other servants and strangers had not, Ex. xii 44; though strangers might have it if they would become circumcised i. d. 48, 49; and all other servants seem to have had a right to the other feasts: Ex. xxiii 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, Lev. xxii 10, 11, xxv 1, 6, 8, 13, Deut. xii 10, 11, 12, xvi 9—12, 13—17. They were instructed or educated: Josh. viii 33, 35. They enjoyed the Sabbath and sabbath privileges; Ex. xx 10, Deut. v 12--15. They appear to have had a right to hold property and have servants of their own,—Lev. xxv 49, 1st Kings xvi 8, 2d Sam. ix 2, 10, xvi 1. They had an equality in religious worship; Deut. xvi 9—17. *They were governed by equal laws;* Ex. xii 49, Deut. xvi 18, 19, Josh. viii 33, 35, 2d Kings xxiii 2, 2d Chron. xxxiv 30. They might be heirs to their masters,—Gen. xv 3, Prov. xvii 2, Mark xii 7. They exercised the highest offices; Gen. xv 2, xxiv 2, 18, 32, 34, 54, 56, 2d Kings v 20, 21, 25, Prov. xvii 2. They might be soldiers; Gen. xiv 14. If their masters abused them to the extent of mayhem they were set free; Ex. xxi 26, 27. They married into their master's families; 2d Chron. ii 34. They were treated with respect; 1st Sam. ix 22, &c. In short, a critical investigation shows, that there was hardly any right or privilege that *children* were entitled to in Israel, (vide Gal. iv 1,), but what these 'bond servants' 'bought with money' were equally entitled to by the Law of God. The existence of these legal rights and privileges proves that they could not have been 'goods and chattels', and that they must have been 'bought' and 'sold' for *servants* and not for slaves. It certainly requires an uncommon degree of effrontery, to pretend in the face of such proof to the contrary, that the Almighty established *slavery* by *law* in Israel!

There is not the slightest reason to believe that any of the Hebrew Servitudes were *hereditary*; as our slavery is. The 'bond-service' of the parents never attached to their children. All *Hebrew* servants were freed at the commencement of every seventh year called the year of Release —vide Ex. xxi 2, Deut. xv 12; and all servants whatever were freed at the commencement of every fiftieth year called the Year of Jubilee; vide Lev. xxv 10. It has been conjectured by some, that before the enactment of the Levitical law, there was a species of mild hereditary servitude among the *patriarchs*, the phrase '*born in the house*' being supposed to favor the conjecture. The context however furnishes no ground to warrant this interpretation. And the *treatment* these servants received and the confidence reposed in them, show that they could not have been *slaves*. What the precise relation between them was, does not clearly appear; but the whole context goes clearly to show, that it was any thing but that of a master to his slaves. Such a relation is wholly inconsistent with the character of Abraham who was a 'preacher of *righteousness*', and who practised all the christian virtues as his history shows. The whole story as told in Genesis proves, that the relation was much nearer that of a father to his children, or of a humane guardian to his grateful and affectionate wards, than that of a tyrannical master to his sullen, cringing slaves. As a specimen, see Gen. xiv 14. Our southern patriarchs would hardly dare to make *soldiers* of their human cattle.

And this leads me to a consideration of the *Uses of Conjecture*. It is well known to classical scholars, that all ancient books contain numerous passages whose meaning is so obscure, owing chiefly to our loss of the knowledge of ancient manners and customs, that critics have no resource left to elucidate their probable meaning but *conjecture*, or, *guessing* at their meaning; and that annotations and commentaries on almost every ancient author are full of these critical conjectures. And provided such conjectures be agreeable to analogy and therefore probable, no reasonable objection can be raised against them. Even infidels cannot reasonably object to their use, because *they* are as often compelled to resort to conjecture in argument as others; and it is to be feared, often contrary to analogy. By the help of this reasonable license, Mr. Dickey has given the most satisfactory explanation of the probable nature of the relation that Abraham sustained towards his servants 'born in his house' that I have seen. He contends, that as Abraham was a prophet while he was living in Haran, (Gen. xi 31), he diligently instructed his neighbors in the truths of religion, and through the Divine blessing *made* many disciples. He became a spisitual father to them and they were dear as children to him. And that they became so attached to him that they would not leave him, and when he left Haran (Gen. xii 5,) he took all the 'souls he had gotten' there, that is, all the converts he had made to his religion along with him. That Abraham being a prince and needing a large retinue, these converts composed his household and served him for reasonable wages, and were in this the Old Testament sense

'*bought* [i. e. hired] *with Abraham's money*' (Gen. xvii 12, 13,) '*of the stranger*', (i. d. 27,) that is, in the country of Haran. This conjecture is greatly corroborated by the fact that the context shows, that *voluntary* sales of men do in the Old Testament language, mean sales of their *services* or *revenues*; vide Gen. xlvii 19, 23, 26. Mr. Dickey supposes the '*servants born in Abraham's house*'—(Gen. xvii 12, 13, 23, 27,) were the children of Abraham's first converts, who raised up families while in his service and educated them in the knowledge and practice of the true religion. Mr. D. argues with the greatest reason, that this is the only construction that can be given consistent with Abraham's recorded character for *justice*; vide Gen. xviii 19. That a man who was so scrupulous in this respect, that he would not partake of the least plunder obtained in war; (vide Gen. xiv 22, 23,), would of all men be the least likely to kidnap and enslave men; and that it is ridiculous to suppose the 'Father of the faithful' would keep slaves at work with long whips wielded by savage overseers, feeding them on a peck of corn a week, or exhibiting conduct in any other respect resembling that of our modern slaveholders. I think so too. What an idea,—to imagine the 'Father of the faithful' who 'talked with God', buying, selling, threatening, starving, torturing his slaves, forbidding them to read the word of life or practise the common duties of religion, amalgamating with the females, selling perhaps his own children, and committing the long list of penal atrocities, for which the vilest criminals are subjected to felonious punishment, in all countries where just laws prevail; and like some of our modern preachers, buying and selling slaves on week days, and preaching righteousness on the Sabbath'! What honest man believes in this character of father Abraham!

And if these views be correct, what blasphemy is it to compare our slaveholders with the patriarchs of old, and with God's ancient chosen covenant people. The Arabs, the Turks, the Buccaneers and other robbers and pirates, will bear the comparison better. Think of slaveholders being 'a *holy*, peculiar people, zealous of *good* works'!—Deut. xiv 2, Tit. ii 14. And think too of the blasphemous pretence of bringing the slaves from Africa, to enjoy *gospel light* and privileges, and the *blessings* of christianity that are to be found on slave plantations; whereas it would be nearly as proper to pretend to gospel light and blessings in hell; and when every body knows, that the only motive which ever supported the slave trade was the profit of the kidnappers, slavetraders and slaveholders. No other motives were ever enlisted in the sales and purchases of *slaves*, than in those of cattle, horses and other brute animals.

It is insisted by some, that the Israelites actually did in some cases practice slavish bondage. They certainly did in one case, *as a commutation of the punishment of death* expressly commanded by God,—vide Deut. vii 1, 2, Josh. ix 27. And because this commutation was exceeded, the nation was afterwards punished; vide 2d Sam. xxi 1, 2. And when the nation degenerated, became corrupt *and broke the Levitical law*, (vide Lev. xxv 35, 39, Deut. xv 7.), they sometimes did the same thing; vide 1st Kings xii 10, 11, 2d Kings iii 1, 2, 3, iv 1, &c., Neh. v 1, 13, and other passages. But even in the most degenerate times of the nation, there was no slave market for the 'bond-servants' in Israel. For on a particular occasion when such a market was attempted to be opened, the people at the remonstrance of a prophet, revolted at it, and restored the captives with presents, vide 2d Chron. xxviii 6, 15. It should be recollected, that the Israelites were surrounded by heathen nations, who practised all manner of abominations, human oppression among the rest; and as the Israelites were chosen to preserve the true religion, they were expressly forbidden all contact with these abominations, under the severest penalties; vide Lev. xviii 24, 25, Deut. ix 4. See the awful denunciations for the neglect or breach of the moral law in Lev. xxvi 14, 39, and Deut. xxviii 15, 68. But notwithstanding the severity of these terrible regulations, the people were prone to the sins of the neighboring heathen, and sometimes relapsed into idolatry and other heinous crimes; and when they did so *they were punished accordingly*; vide 2d Kings xxi. 8, 20, xxv 1, 11, &c., 2d Chron. xii 1, 4, xxi 6, 19, xxiv 17, 25, xxxvi 14, 21, and many other instances.

The existence of the Servitudes among the Israelites, presented a most tempting occasion for the practice of oppression, to those rich Israelites who had the power over their poorer brethren: which was probably the reason why God so severely threatened the commission of this sin,—vide Ex. xxii 22, 27, Lev. xix 13, Deut. xv 9, xxiv 15. So far from sanctioning or conniving at any thing like slavish oppression in Israel, the most special and effectual regulations were provided in the Levitical code, to guard *against* it; and special provisions were inserted for the benefit of the poor, the fatherless and the afflicted,—vide Ex. xxii 25, 26, 27, Lev. xix 9, 10, xxiii 22, Deut. xxiv 6, 10, 13, 19, 21. And to render the observance of these humane and excellent regulations the more effectual, the people were reminded of their own bitter experience of slavish oppression, as the strongest incentive to induce them, to show mercy and kindness to the poor,—vide Deut. xvi 12, xxiv 18, 22, and several other passages. Nevertheless, the rich Israelites were for the reasons already given, extremely prone to neglect and break the laws against oppression; and prophets were from time to time commissioned and sent to them, to threaten and reform them, *especially from the sin of oppression*; vide Neh. v 1—13, Jer. vii 1—7, xxii 1—9, 16, 17, Eze. xxii 1—13. The common law is greatly praised for its benevolent care of the poor and afflicted, and in that respect is probably the most perfect *human* code that ever existed. But it falls vastly short of the Levitical law, in tender regard for the welfare of the

poor, and in the strictness of its provisions for the prevention of all those various oppressions, to which they are so liable. The Levitical law is in fact in its whole frame and structure, admirably adapted to the *prevention* of every species of tyranny. It utterly forbids all respect to persons in judgment,—vide Ex. xxiii 2, 3, Lev. xix 15, Deut. i 17, xvi 19,-xxvii 19. No human code will at all compare with it in the perfection of its equity. Yet strange and horrible to tell, this very code is at the present time, in a christian nation boasting of its knowledge, refinement and high privileges, brought forward and quoted in justification of the blackest and bloodiest system of tyrannical oppression that ever existed under heaven!!

So particularly pointed was the Levitical law *against* human oppression, that the mere voluntary escape of a servant from his master was deemed to be sufficient presumptive evidence, that he had been oppressed in his master's service, and that he was therefore entitled to his freedom, —vide Deut. xxiii 15, 16. No other law ever guarded the rights and safety of servants with so much and such jealous care,—vide Ex. xxi 26, 27. It should be remarked of the principal case here quoted, that the servant could not be subjected to servitude again after his escape, without his own consent. He was to dwell in any place he liked which *he* should choose. This fact shows that the Israelites were obliged to protect fugitive slaves from the surrounding nations, even at the peril of war. This law is the spirit of the whole Bible; vide Ps. xxxi 8, Isa. xvi 3, 4,; and the violation of it violates that spirit; vide Oba. 10—15. Some contend that this law was made for the exclusive benefit of *foreign* fugitive slaves. But there is no ground for this notion. The generality of the words proves that it was intended for all servants alike, domestic as well as foreign. There is no room for exclusive construction. Were such a provision to be inserted into all our slave codes, slavery would not exist a month in any part of the United States. This is the way the Levitical law sanctioned slavery!

And yet strange to relate, that very conduct in servants which by the Levitical law entitled them to freedom, is by the slave laws and customs of a professedly *christian* country, held to be one of the greatest offences which a slave can commit, and condemns him to the most cruel punishment and still more rigorous bondage! No crime in a slave is so great in the view of a slave holder, as that of running away from his master, though to avoid the greatest possible oppression. We are commanded in the Scriptures to love and assist our fellow men, and take their part when wronged and oppressed; yet if a slave assist a fellow slave to flee from bondage, he is held to be guilty of a great crime. And as if the outrages of slave laws on the Law of God, were not alone sufficiently wicked, the laws of the United States and those of some of the free states, pretended to be made by authority, of a constructive clause of the constitution of the United States, (Art. 4, Sec. 2,), are made auxiliaries in the detection and punishment of the offence!

Had real slavery existed in the Hebrew nation, by virtue of the Levitical law, its *practice*, effects and consequences would have similar to those now existing in our slaves states, and as they uniformly have existed in all slave countries. But we have not the slightest trace of any account in the Bible, *so long as the Israelites observed that law*, of any such atrocities and cruelties in that nation, as are fitly denominated the "Horrors of Slavery". It was only when they *broke the law*, that they practised human oppression. As has been shown, all manner of injustice and cruelty towards the Israelitish servants was strictly forbidden by the Divine law; which prohibition the Almighty would not have enacted, had He intended to establish real slavery as it exists in the United States. The fact that He jealously guarded the natural rights of servants by express laws for that purpose proves, that though He established several mild kinds of *servitude* for the benefit of the poor servants themselves, He most effectually prohibited every thing like *slavery* of any description.

Slavery like other Tyranny, is not a crime against the Law of God or the common law, *by that name*. The treatment which the Hebrews received from the Egyptians, though far less oppressive than that which our slaves receive. (vide Ex. i 11—14, ii 23, v 7—10,), was yet of the *same nature* so far as it went, with that which all real slaves receive; and was so great a sin as to be punishable with ten severe plagues on the whole Egyptian nation, among which was the destruction of all their first born, and in the conclusion the destruction of their king and army. This treatment is expressly called "*oppression*" in the Scriptures, (Ex. i 1—14, iii 9, Isa. lviii 6,), which it would not have been, unless it were to denounce it as a *sin*. '*Oppression*' of every description, is wherever it occurs in the Bible, denounced as a great sin,—vide Deut. xxvi 7, 2d Kings xiii 4, Job xxxv 9, Ps. xii 5. lxxii 3, cxix 134, Eccl. v 8, vii 7, Eze. xxii 7, 29, Zeph. iii 1, Zech. ix 8, and numerous other passages equally plain. And this great sin, as the context of almost every quotation shows, was punished with all manner of judicial severities, even slaughter and death. No doctrine can be plainer than this. "*Man-stealing*" also, or the modern crime of kidnapping and involuntary sales of men, is the highest degree of human oppression, and is punishable by the Law of God with sure death; vide Deut. xxiv 7. This statute, except the civil penalty, is still in force; vide 2st Tim. i 10. And it is remarkable that the Greek word *Candrapodistai)*, translated "*man-stealers*" in the passage quoted from 1st Timothy, means slave-*owners* or slave-*holders*, much more nearly than it does slave-traders or kidnappers; as all Greek scholars know. The punishment of murder was no more than death, by the Levitical law; vide Lev. xxiv, 17, 21,—Numb. xxxv, 30,—Slavery therefore, by the names of '*hard bondage*' '*oppres-*

sion' and '*men-stealing*' is as great a crime as murder, by the *express words* of the Law of God.

And it is remarkable also, that the '*oppressions*' of the Hebrews were inflicted, *according to law*,—vide Ex. i 9, 10, 11, v 5—9. And it was for *customary* 'oppression', that the Israelites were so often threatened and punished. Most people argue on the abolition question, as if *legalized* crimes became just and sacred rights, and entitled to respect as such; that is, if they can sin according to *law*, they have a just *right* to sin. Yet it was for such sins and such only, that so many nations have been destroyed by God's exterminating judgments! This terrible fact ought to be heeded, as a sure warning of the certain doom of our own country, if the giant sin of slavery be not repented of and abandoned.

The *consequences* of slavery show that it is as great a crime as murder. It produces a living death; for what is life worth deprived of its blessings and enjoyments? Multitudes of slaves have actually preferred death to slavery. And death was declared by our ancestors, to be the best lot of the two conditions. Slavery deprives men of the 'key of knowledge', and of the means of securing their future happiness; it subjects them to the infliction of the greatest possible cruelties of every description, as already stated, which frequently render death a blessing; it destroys all the peace and happiness of the slaves, both of body and mind, and leaves them without all rational hope both now and hereafter. It is hardly less destructive to the masters than to the slaves. It demoralizes and corrupts them to the lowest degree. It makes them all unprincipled tyrants, and renders them the very worst members of society. Slaveholders imbibe from the practice of slavery, the most arbitrary, domineering, dictatorial, insolent and capricious dispositions, always at war with the rights of others and with the spirit of christianity. It makes them all idlers and spend-thrifts, and renders them savage in a civilized country. It generates all other crimes and makes their perpetration necessary, as before stated. It impoverishes the country that tolerates it, and invokes upon it the just vengeance of Heaven. Neither the practice of murder or any other crime, can produce any *worse* effects than these.

Slavery not only contradicts the whole spirit and genius of the Scriptures, in the manner already shown, but is a direct breach of two commands in the Decalogue, the *eighth* and the *tenth*. That *stealing* of every description is a crime punishable in all cases by the Law of God, I need not quote passages to prove. Slavery the highest degree of it by the name of '*man* stealing', is as we have seen, punishable with its highest civil penalty, death. But slavery is an express breach of the *tenth* commandment. Hardly any sin is denounced with greater severity in the Bible, than that of *covetousness*,—vide Ex. xx 17, Deut. v 21, Josh. vii 21 &c. *Ps.* x 3, Isa. lvii 17, Mic. ii 2. Heb. ii 9, 12, Mark vii 22, Luke xii 15, Acts v 1– 10, Rom. i 29, vii 7, xiii 9, 1st Cor. v 10, 11, vi 10, Eph. v 5, Col. iii 5, 2d Tim. ii 2. *Covetousness* is a greedy desire of the just property and rights of others; and besides destroying the peace of him who harbors the sin in his heart, it is apt beyond almost any other sin, to allure him into dishonest and criminal practises, to gratify his criminal desires. The Law of God, which is the most searching and effectual of all laws, (vide Ps. xix 7, &c., Rom. vii 22, Heb. iv 12,), therefore cuts the root of it, by forbidding all covetous *desires*. Now the whole system and practice of slavery, is founded on *this very sin*. The command is, "*Thou shalt not covet* [greedily desire] . . . . . *any thing that is thy neighbor's*". By the Law of God, every person is (under God) his own owner; the owner of his own body, limbs and faculties; the owner of his own time, industry, strength and skill; the owner of his own wife and children; the owner of his own Rights, his Security, his Liberty, his Property, &c.; all as the *gift* of his Maker, as has been clearly shown. Now slavery usurps all these, plunders the slaves of them, and devotes them to the sole use of the masters, out of *a greedy and criminal desire* to possess and use them; or, simply out of covetousness. Some corruptionists to support slavery have suggested, that as 'men-servants' and 'maid-servants', are mentioned in the same connexion with 'oxen' and 'asses' in the tenth commandment, the owner must have sustained the *same relation* to the servants, that he did to these beasts. But as we have abundantly proven, that none of these 'servants' could be slaves, by virtue of the Law of God, and as '*wives*' are also mentioned in the same connexion, there is not much danger that this contemptible perversion, will gain extensive allowance.

The perversions of passages of the *New* Testament, forged to sustain slavery, are much less numerous than those which have been noticed; and it would be a sufficient answer to the whole of them, to state, that Christ, and his apostles the compilers of that volume, have in numerous instances, *directly* condemned all human oppression, as a *sin* of the first magnitude, as the numerous passages quoted in this lecture will show; and that the whole *spirit* of the New Testament, breathes nothing but perfect liberty, both temporal and spiritual; vide John viii 32, Rom. viii 15—21, Gal. v 1, Heb. ii 15, and numerous other passages of similar import. It is impossible that any part of such a book, should have been intended to justify slavish oppression. Temporal slavery directly and necessarily produces spiritual bondage, the very evil the Gospel was sent to eradicate.

Christ expressly declared that he did not come as a temporal lawgiver. The objects of his mission were, to fulfil the old dispensation, introduce a new one, exhibit a perfect example, and proclaim *general* rules, adapted to particular conduct in all cases, public as well as private, and to the fabrication of laws and customs among the rest. When therefore, he or his followers the

New Testament compilers, condemned injustice and oppression in *general* terms, they meant of course every species of them, and most of all, the highest degree of them—slavery. Now the New Testament is every where full of this direct condemnation. A great number of vicious and criminal practises, are not condemned *by name* in the New Testament; such for instance as counterfeiting, forgery, arson, theatres, gambling and hundred others. But whoever supposes that these and all other wicked practices, are not strictly condemned by the spirit if not the letter of the New Testament, as well as the Old, must be reall or designedly ignorant of both. Every species of vicious and destructive practices, are strictly forbidden, by the *plain* spirit of the New Testament. Look at the following passages, Rom. xii 9, 17, 18, 19, xiii 13, xiv 16—19, 1st Thess. iv 1, v 22, and a hundred other passages, collectively forbidding, *every* evil and destructive practice. It is wonderful that in the face of such evidence to the contrary, it should ever have been pretended, that any part of the New Testament sanctioned slavery.

The phrase 'bought with a *price* &c.', (1st Cor. vi 20,), has been basely perverted to mean *slave* purchases; whereas the purchases here symbolically alluded to, are those of persons in 'bondage', ransomed to become *freemen*, instead of Slaves. Such is the plain spirit and meaning of the whole context; vide John viii 36, Acts. xx 28, Rom. vi 18, 22, 1st Cor. vii 22, 23, Gal. iii 13, Heb. ix 12, 1st Pet. i 18, 19, Rev. v 9, and numerous other passages. Ransomed persons never become the 'property' of their ransomers. The mode of 'ransom' was a type of freedom instead of slavery. Christians are 'redeemed' *from* not into 'bondage'. Christ redeemed or ransomed them, to be his willing *servants*, (not unwilling slaves), by the 'purchase of his blood.' Yet this blasphemous and despicable perversion, has been gravely employed by slaveholding divines and other corruptionists, to justify the most absolute and cruel slavery, both spiritual and temporal! And the use of it proves, that as slavery is one of the greatest of crimes, so it can only be supported, by the agency of crimes of equal enormity.

The Greek word for 'slaves' is "*andrapoda*", and for 'slaveholders' "*andrapodistai*", the relation between whom is nowhere regulated in the New Testament. It is simply condemned by reference and classification, in 1st Tim. i 10. The wicked relations of men, such as those of criminals to their victims, are nowhere regulated in the Bible. The relations of murderers, thieves, robbers, &c., towards their victims, are not at all sanctioned in this way. They are simply condemned and forbidden as sins; and those are threatened with sure punishment who persist in them. The Bible doctrine is, *to destroy*, not to attempt to meliorate, slavery and other crimes; simply because they are incapable of melioration. The behaviour of persons *subjected* to wicked relations, is frequently regulated in the Scriptures; vide Ez. vi 10, Jer. xxix 7, Matt. v 39, 44, Rom. xii 14, 20, 1st Tim. ii 2, 1st Pet. ii 20, and various other passages. But the relations themselves are never regulated, because they are sinful relations. I have but little doubt but that the 'servants under the yoke' (1st Tim. vi 1, 2,), were real slaves. But mark the direction. The relation itself is not approved. No direction is given to the master in this case. *He* is not licensed to hold slaves, any more than the striker to smite the 'other cheek'. On the contrary, the 'servants' are directed to terminate the relation if they can; if not, to endure it patiently; vide 1st Cor. vii 21. The direction in this passage is applicable to the case of slaves, if to any. And if it be the duty of the slave to obtain his freedom, it must be the corresponding duty of his master to give it to him. The duty of christian submission to ill treatment, is a duty injured persons owe to *God*, not to their oppressors.

The Greek words for 'servants' are "*doulοi*" and "*oiketai*", and for 'masters' "*kurioi*" and "*despotai*", which are always used in the New Testament, to express the same relation, that our words 'master' and 'servant' are. Thus St. Paul was not a slave in any sense, though he styles himself 'a servant' and Christ his master, as the other apostles did,—vide Luke ii 29, Acts. ii 18, Rom. i 1, Phil. i 1, Tit. i 1, James i 1, &c. Nor is the word 'servant' ever used in the New Testament, in any slavish sense whatever; that is, no slavish directions or injunctions are ever given in connection with it. The necessary and beneficial relation of master and *servant*, in its ordinary sense, is approved of in all parts of the Bible, and ample general directions are given for its good regulation; vide Eph. vi 5—9, Col. iii 22, iv 1, Tit. ii 9, 1st Pet. ii 18, and other passages. These directions are so pure and excellent, that it cannot be reasonably supposed they were intended to regulate *slavery*. For if they were they must have defeated their own intentions; for if they be strictly followed, they will put an immediate end to the relation! The simple directions given in Eph. vi 9, Col. iv 1, and Philem. 16, if strictly obeyed by all slaveholders, would put an end to slavery in a day! There is not the slightest proof that Onesimus was a slave. He might have been a servant of any other kind, and yet wronged his master or employer. And the directions of the apostle to Philemon show, that masters ought never to treat their servants, as slaves are usually treated. According to the spirit of the epistle, all servants should be treated like *brethren*. It is curious that the case in Matt. xviii 23—34, should have been considered as that of a *slave;* for a slave can no more '*owe*' his master, than a horse or a piece of furniture can. It was a simple allusion, to the sale of an insolvent debtor, under the harsh and oppressive laws of the Roman Empire; not under the Law of God. I might proceed to notice some other minor perversions, but the foregoing are amply sufficient. None of them will influence those who are acquainted with the spirit of the Bible, and are desirous to

regulate their own conduct by it; and those who are not, will practice slavery or any other crime they choose, whether the Scriptures be perverted or not.

It has been gravely declared by pro-slavery divines, that the New Testament did not *condemn* slavery, as it existed in the Roman Empire; and from these premises it has been as gravely concluded, that the Gospel did not *interfere* with that slavery. But the premises are not true. Every ingredient of slavery is strictly condemned and denounced in the New Testament; vide Matt. xxiii 4, 14, Mark x 19, xii 40, 1st Cor. v 8, 9, 10, Eph. iv 31, 1st Thess. iv 6, James ii 6—16, v 4, Rev. xviii 13, and a hundred other passages equally plain. Christ also is supposed, to have expressly forbidden the practice of slavery, and all other arbitrary authority, among his followers, in Matt. xx 25—28, vide also 1st Cor. vi 7—10. These and a hundred other pointed passages, cut up slaveholding by the roots. Besides, slavery is wholly inconsistent and irreconcilable, with the manifold directions in all parts of the New Testament, for the constant exercise of *love, honour, charity &c.*, towards all men. But there is no need of further argument. Slavery is as contrary to the *whole spirit* of the New Testament as murder is. And how consistent is it, for *christians* to quote *heathen* examples, in justification of crimes against the christian religion! Why not on the strength of such premises, practice theatrical exhibitions, gladiatorial shows, human sacrifices, infanticide, heathen feasts, the Olympic games, military government, despotic law, and a hundred other heathen abominations; for they are 'not interfered with' or condemned *by name* in the New Testament, any more than Roman slavery was!

I have thus proved beyond a reasonable doubt, that Slavery is as great a crime against the Law of Revelation, as murder or any other crime, and that it is fully equal to murder, in guilt and enormity. And such being the admitted fact, it is shocking to think, that there have been men in the *christian church*, wicked enough to pervert the Scriptures, for the sake of justifying this abomination, and supporting its practice. All the perversions I have refuted, were first forged in the Roman Catholic church, more than 300 years ago, for the *express purpose* of justifying negro slavery, the practice of which among christians had just then commenced. And for the purpose of justifying the perversions, they pretended that *Moses* instead of God, enacted the Levitical law; and that finding slavery established in Israel by custom, and not being able to abolish it, he endeavored to regulate and mitigate it, by good legislation; and many of their protestant successors copied the doctrine. But this was if possible, a worse perversion than the rest. For the Levitical law was enacted from 'Sinai's fiery top' a few weeks only after the Israelites were themselves delivered from slavish bondage; and the Scriptures expressly declare, that God himself (not Moses) made that law; vide Ex. xix 5, 8, xx 1, Heb. i 1, and many other passages.—And as has been remarked, there is no account in the Bible, of any slavish oppression in Israel, except when the nation broke that law. The perversion is therefore, without a shadow of reasonable foundation or apology. And these gross and scandalous perversions, have been since copied and adopted, by most protestant theological writers and preachers, in too many cases it is to be feared, for the same impious purpose. Here is a case in point to illustrate the effects, of the excessive *selfishness* of mankind. When the protestants were persecuted by the catholics, they could readily detect the Scriptural perversions, by which such treatment was attempted to be justified. But when they *themselves* became oppressors, they could agree with the Catholics, in perversions for their own justification! Most of our theological works that treat of the Hebrew Servitudes, stupidly copy the old popish perversions, seemingly without the least examination, or comparison with the rest of the Scriptures, or critical scrutiny into the real meaning of the perverted texts. And this criminal neglect and adhesion is the principal reason, why so many of the protestant as well as popish clergy, are so grossly ignorant of the true derivation, nature and extent of Human Rights; and why the practice of *good works*, on the duties of *men to men*, are so seldom inculcated by them.

It is difficult to conceive how a person can be a christian, and yet support slavery—vide 1st John iii 10, iv 20, 21, and many other passages of the same import. It is a well settled doctrine among all christian sects, that unless men actually *love* God, they 'cannot be saved.' And it would seem to be as clear from Scripture, that unless they actually 'love' their 'neighbor,' or have a universal 'love' for all mankind, (vide Luke vi 27–35, x 29–37, Rom. xii 9, 17, 18, 2d Cor. viii 21, 1st Pet. ii 17, and a multitude of other passages,) they also 'cannot be saved.' Universal benevolence is commanded by the spirit of the whole Scriptures. Partial benevolence though of the strongest kind, will save nobody—vide Matt. vi 29, 46, 47. Luke vi 32–34. It is not probable that any sect of christians were ever more formal and devotional, than the ancient Pharisees were—vide Matt. vi 2, 5, 16, xix 20, xxiii 5, 6, 25–28, Acts xxii 3, xxvi 5, Phil. iii 5. And yet we find their salvation impossible, on account of their Hypocrisy and Oppression, the very sins of which the slaveholders, of all men are most guilty—vide Matt, xxiii 3, 4, 14, 23, 25, 28, 31–33, Mark xii 40, Luke xi 46, xx 47. No slaveholder *can* 'love' his slaves in the scriptural sense. His whole treatment of them is the result of *perfect hatred* to them and their rights. No person who really loves another, will injure or abuse him. And however much slaveholders may 'love' each other, or other freemen, yet so long as they enslave any part of mankind, they 'cannot be saved'. Slavery is founded in utter hatred and contempt of righteousness and justice, and in opposition to the command to 'love our neighbor'. Love to our neighbor being mentioned in

the same connexion with love to God, (vide Matt. xxii 37—40, and other passages), proves it to be a paramount doctrine; and the want of sufficient *practice* under it, has been for the want of sufficient *preaching* of the doctrine. Mr. Crothers asserts 'fearless of successful contradiction, that prior to the existence of the Slave trade, no christian of piety and intelligence ever undertook to expound the Law of God given by Moses, as authorising involuntary, hereditary, perpetual slavery'. And that 'the blasphemies of the Pope on this subject have been palmed on the world as the old divinity,—as the doctrines which God revealed from heaven.' I have no doubt of the general correctness of this assertion. And as it is a fact, that previous to the commencement of the negro slave trade, christianity had extirpated human slavery, from all those parts of christendom where it prevailed in any tolerable degree of purity, the presumption is, that these base perversions were at that period wholly unknown, and that up to that time, all real christians had well understood, that human slavery was a mortal sin. And the fact, that American slaves have never been permitted to read the Scriptures, affords another presumption, that these perversions were *wilful* and intentional. Certain it is, that if the present slaveholders or their spiritual guides, did sincerely believe in the truth of those perversions, they would diligently instruct their slaves in the knowledge of the Scriptures, as the best guaranty they could have for their fidelity. And the fact that they do not and will not, because they *dare not* thus instruct them, proves their hypocrisy. They understand the spirit of the Scriptures better. They well know, there is not another book in the world, that vindicates and establishes the equal rights of all men, and denounces their infringement, with half the energy, severity and copiousness, that the Bible does. They know it is the most republican book in the world. And *for this very reason*, they will not permit the victims of their impious oppressions, to know any thing correctly about it.

I have now nearly completed my proposed criticisms on this interesting subject. Not that such criticisms are at all exhausted; but because it seems to me, that enough and more than enough has been written, to prove the great object of the Lecture, namely, the sinfulness of slavery. I have been somewhat prolix, in the examination and refutation of the perversions treated of, on account of their being the last and only final 'refuge of lies,' used to defend the abominations of slavery, and on account of the consequent zeal and obstinacy with which they are maintained. But I recommend to all who have the opportunity, to investigate the whole subject, still more critically than I have done; assuring them for their encouragement, that the further they push their critical researches, the clearer and stronger will the case appear against slavery. And to aid them in the premises, I will add a few more general remarks, most of which have been heretofore published, but which may afford some assistance in a course of critical inquiry.

Almost every crime against the Christian religion has been attempted to be justified, by *perversions* of the Bible. Perversions are a *turning* or wresting of the true to a false meaning. Thus religious persecutions, legitimacy or the divine rights of kings, aristocracy, offensive war, human oppression, murder, theft, robbery, polygamy, and other abominations, have all been attempted to be vindicated by these criminal means. Perversions of the true meaning of the Scriptures are most heinous sins—vide Ps. cxix 126, Isaiah v 20. Jer. xviii 15, xxiii 36, Eze. v 6-8, xiii 9-16, xxii 26, 28, Mic. iii 9, Hab. i 4, Zeph. iii 4, Mal. ii 7, 8, Matt. xv 3, 6, 9, Mark vii 8, Acts xiii 10, xv 1, 24, 2d Cor. ii 17, Gal. i 7, Col. ii 8, 1st Pet. i 18, 2d Pet. ii 1, iii 16, and other passages. But nothing has been more common than such blasphemous 'refuges of lies,' when the supposed interests of wicked men have required support. Thus tyrants, persecutors and criminals of all sorts, have *appealed to the Bible* in justification of their conduct. The horrors of the Inquisition, and of all other religious persecutions, have been pretended to be founded on Christian principles! It is unnecessary to inquire, whether these corruptionists were like St. Paul, *honest* in their sins. Perhaps many of them sinned in ignorance. Probably very few of them were guilty of as much wilful sin, as the present slaveholders are. They did not sin against half the light and knowledge—vide 2d Chron. vi 22, 23, Job xx iv 13, Luke xii 47, 48, John iii 20, Eph. v 13, Heb. x 26.

By the law of God, neglect of known duty, or sins of wilful *omission*, (vide ante,) is one of the greatest of sins; vide Deut. xxxi 16-18, 29, xxxii 15--43, Judges ii 12--10, 6--13, Heb. ii 3, and many other passages. Especially is neglect of the *poor*, the afflicted and the helpless a great sin; vide Prov. xiv 20, 21, xvii 5, xviii 23, xxi 13, xxii 16, Eze. xvi 49. James ii 2--4, and numerous other passages. Not only the positive oppression of the poor, but the *neglect* to relieve their wants and necessities, is condemned as a great sin. And it should be observed,

that the connexion to almost every quotation here made, denounces the severest retribution for such criminal neglect. It should also be remembered, that all the virtues opposed to this vice, such as care, charity, mercy and justice to the poor, the afflicted and the oppressed, are recommended and enjoined in the strongest terms, over and over again in the Bible; vide Lev. xix 9, 10, xxiii 22, xxv 35--38, Deut. xiv 29, xv 7--11, xxiv 19- 22, Ps. xxxvii 26, xli 1, Prov. xiv 21. 31, xix 17, xxii 9, xxviii 27, Luke iii 2, 2d Cor. ix 6, 7, 9, 1st John iii 17, and a hundred other similar passages. Charity and kindness to the poor and the afflicted, are virtues inculcated in the strongest manner all over the Bible. Christ came to exemplify these virtues, (Isa. lxi 1, Luke iv 18-21;) and both he and his followers taught and practised them in the most exemplary manner. They are every where represented in the Scriptures as essential articles of the Christian religion. No other system of morals, or religion, or law in the world, has provided for the support, the protection and consolation of the poor, the afflicted and the oppressed, with half the care that the Law of God revealed in the Bible has. Is it probable, or even credible then, that this most equitable, merciful and righteous law, or any part of it, should ratify or even countenance, or in the least degree connive at, the most barbarous and brutal system of human oppression, that the light of the sun ever shone on!

But we have abundance of positive as well as circumstantial proof in the Bible to the contrary. And in order to place the guilt of the practice of Christian slaveholding and slavetrading in a strong light, I affirm this proposition, namely, that if there be one doctrine more plainly and clearly taught in the Bible than another, it is the doctrine *of the utter condemnation, reprobation and denunciation of every kind and degree of Human Oppression*, especially all slavish oppression. It is a *leading, prominent*, principal doctrine of the Bible. The ten commandments are not plainer. More than a thousand passages of Scripture can be readily quoted, in direct vindication of it. Distinct traces of it are to be observed in all parts of the Sacred Volume. Judgments were denounced and inflicted, armies and individuals destroyed, nations conquered and subjected by their enemies, and all other sorts of national penalties inflicted, as punishments, principally for the commission of *this very sin* of Human Oppression—vide Gen. vi 11--17, xviii 21--21, Ex. iii 9, xii 29, xiv 28, Deut. xxviii 15-68, Job xx 19, xxvii 13--23, Ps. lxiv 1--8, Prov. i 11, x 1--3, Isa. x 1--4, xiv 2, xvi 4 xix 20, Eze. vii 23--27, ix 9, xviii 10-13, xxii 29 31, Amos iv 1, viii 4- 8, Mic. vi 12, vii 2, 3, Nah. iii 1, Hab. ii 8, Zeph. iii 1--8 &c. Zech. vii 9--14, Matt. xxiii 14, Mark xii 40, Luke xx 47, Rev. xviii 13, and a hundred other passages equally plain. It should be observed, that in most of the cases of the enumerations of sins, for which judgments were threatened, *this* sin receives a pointed and prominent notice. And where the oppressions were *legal*, or in other words national, the punishments were national also, and inflicted in *this* world. And in every case of such threatenings, *without repentance and reformation* by the nations threatened, the judgments threatened *were always inflicted*; as ancient and modern history will both testify. The punishment of the sin of slavery, is therefore destruction and death, by the *special providence*, as well as the express Law of God, as Pharaoh's case and many others prove; and is as *sure* in the end, as the revolutions of the seasons or the succession of day and night The judgments of God though slow, (Ex. xxxiv 6, 7, Numb. xiv 18, Neh. ix 17, Ps. ciii 8, Rom. ix 22, 2d Pet. iii 9,), and though reprobate men may presume on their non-fulfilment, (Ex. v 2. 2d Kings xviii 35, Job. xxi 15, Prov. xxx 9, Isa. v 19, Jer. xvii 15, Eze. xii 22, 27, Matt. xxiv 48, 2d Pet. iii 3, 4,), yet they are always *sure*, vide Gen. ii 17, Ex. xxii 23, 24, Numb. xiv 25, xxiii 19, Deut xxxii 35, 1st Sam. xv 29, Eze. v 11, xii 25, 28, xxiv 14, Mal. iii 6, Rom. ii 29, Heb. vi 16--18, 2d Tim. ii 13, Tit. i 2, James i 17, 2d Pet. ii 3, iii 9, &c. and many other passages Without repentance and reformation, God *always* punishes for sin—vide Jer. xviii 7--10. From these quotations it is clear that God will overthrow and destroy every nation that persists in the practice of Human Oppression. In corroboration of which doctrine, it is an awful fact, that every ancient nation and most modern ones, who have *persisted* in this sin, are either blotted out as nations, or reduced to slavish bondage; a most ominous warning to those who now practice it. Especially do numerous passages of Scripture attest the doctrine, that oppression of the *poor* is one of the greatest of sins. The severest judgments are always denounced against it—vide Job xx 19, xxiv 3, 7, 9, 14, Ps. x 2, 8, 9, xii 5, Prov. xiv 21. 31, xvii 5, xxi 13, xxii 16, 22, 23,

xxviii 15–17, xxx 14, Eccl. v 8, Isa. iii 14, 15, xxxii 7, Jer. xl 34, xxii 3, Amos v 11, 12, 21–24, Hab. iii 14, James ii 6, and a great number of other passages. Where doctrines are so very plainly taught, perversions of the Scriptures to justify practises the Bible so severely reprobates and condemns, must be excessively reckless, presumptuous and wicked.

Slavery, as it exists in the U. States, is the highest degree and worst form of Human Oppression. Let people beware then how they wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction. All must admit, that the *whole spirit, genius* and *tendency* of the Bible, as has been clearly shown, are utterly hostile to the practice of slavery. Common sense, therefore, teaches us, that the construing of some half a dozen texts extracted from the Levitical law and the life of Abraham, without comparing them with the rest of the Scriptures, and so as to make them support *slavery*, must necessarily be a most glaring and blasphemous perversion of their true meaning. Is it credible, that the Almighty (who is no respecter of persons,) should establish a practice among his chosen people by *law*, on account of which same practice, He had just before inflicted the most dreadful plagues on another nation, destroyed all their first born, and finally drowned their king and army by way of punishment! Is it possible, that Abraham and the other patriarchs, practised the barbarities and abominations of modern slavery? Did they differ in character or *practice*, from the holy prophets and apostles?—vide Gen. vi 9, vii 1, xiii 8, 9, xiv 22–24, xv 6, Eze. xiv 14, 20, Rom. iv 2, 3, Gal. iii 6–9, Heb. xi 5–22, 2d Pet. ii 5. Is it credible, that the Almighty 'who is no respecter of persons' should ratify a practice in one nation that He punishes in another! Would the Almighty who is *infinite* in justice and goodness, render the *misfortunes* of the poor, a motive for their enslavement and oppression! Is it possible, that He should enact laws to protect and oppress the poor at the same time! Would He establish an institution which is the climax of human oppression, and at the same time *condemn* such oppression in every other part of the Bible! Would He *indirectly* licence the commission of crimes, that He has directly condemned and forbidden! Surely such monstrous inconsistencies, contradictions and absurdities, ought not to be credible among *christians*. And all candid persons will readily believe, that those who for the sake of supporting slavery and its horrors, have insisted on the reality of such ridiculous contradictions, have basely perverted the true meaning of those parts of the Scriptures, which treat of the Hebrew Servitudes.

The difference between the condition of ordinary servants and slaves is, that the natural rights of the former are always protected by *law*; whereas *slaves* have no such rights to be protected, they being mere 'goods and chattels.' The rights of all *white* women, children and common servants, in the United States, are thus protected. Every body knows this to be the fact. All white servants enjoy the legal rights of Security, Liberty and property, and most of the other rights. Common Servitude and Slavery are entirely distinct things. The former is established for the benefit of the servants as well as the masters; the latter for the benefit of the masters only. Hence, false pretences to the contrary notwithstanding, there is no such thing as white slavery in any part of the United States. If a white woman, child or servant, are treated with any degree of slavish violence or outrage, every body sees at once, that their rights are invaded, the law broken, and that they can have adequate redress for such violations, *by law*. The fact that numerous suits are brought in our courts of justice for such wrongs, proves this fact; as it does the propensity of mankind, to infringe rights and oppress each other, and the necessity of law for the protection of rights. So also were the natural and other rights of the Hebrew servants, most effectually protected by the Levitical law, as has been abundantly shown. It might as well be pretended that our poor laws and apprenticeship acts sanction slavery or *involuntary* servitude, as that the Levitical law establishing the Hebrew Servitudes did. We have as much just reason to believe, that the Sermon on the Mount and the Twelfth chapter of Romans, were intended to support *slavery*, as that the Levitical law was. That part of it establishing the Servitudes, was made for the support of the poor and the *benefit* of the servants, and not for their oppression, as our slave system is.

If has been frequently said in palliation of American slavery, and as if one crime could justify another, that '*as much*' oppression existed in the northern States as in the southern. A greater falsehood never was uttered; and the use of it proves only, that slavery can be support-

ed only by crimes. That there is considerable *pecuniary* oppression of the poor in the northern States, by means of usury, high rents, monopoly and speculation, is true. The aristocrats oppress the multitude by these and other means, as far as the laws permit them; and the only reason they do not enslave them, is because they have not the power. But there is no such thing as *slavish* oppression of the poor whites in the free States, either by law or custom. No white people in those States are made 'goods and chattels' of, bought and sold and treated like beasts, compelled to work without wages, whipped, starved, ravished and otherwise brutified, as slaves are. Their natural and other rights are generally well respected. Indeed, the oppressions of the poor whites in this country, are comparatively light; and no political reformers of the present day, are more anxiously engaged to abolish even *those*, than the modern abolitionists.

The more ancient any book is, the more does it need *critical* study to understand it correctly. This is owing to the long disuse of the most ancient languages, manners, customs and institutions, and of the original meaning of ancient idiomatic phrases and peculiarities. All critics are agreed in the allowance of this rule. It is well known by those who have had the experience, that these losses render it more difficult to understand ancient history of any kind than modern history. The Pentateuch being reputed the oldest book in the world, needs much critical study to be correctly understood. Thus the approved practice of *buying men*, really means in that book, nothing more than *buying their services or returnues*; as the context (Gen. xlvii 19, 23, 26, and other passages,) already proves, and as has been abundantly shown. It was nothing more than a fair contract between the buyer and seller himself, of services for hire or wages. Also the word *'forever,'* used in the description of some of the Servitudes, (vide Ex. xxi 6, Lev. xxv 46, Deut. xv 17,) is translated from a Hebrew phrase, the *literal* meaning of which is *'throughout the term,'* that is, the *'term'* which is the subject matter treated of, in the passage where it occurs. The 'term' treated of in the quotation from Exodus and Deuteronomy, was that part of to accrue till the 'year of Release,' which could in no case be more than six years, (vide Ex. xxi 2, Deut. xv 1, 9, 12, xxxi 10;) and the *object* of the law was *to prevent the separation of husband and wife;* that being the only special reason assigned for the law in the passages quoted. The legal process itself was of the most deliberate, solemn and authentic nature, *out of regard to the liberty and rights of the servants.* The 'term' treated of in the passage quoted from Leviticus, was either the 'term' bargained for, which could not extend beyond the jubilee, (Lev. xxv 10, Jer. xxxiv 8, 14, 15, 17, 18-22,) or it may mean the whole 'term' from jubilee to jubilee, or that part of it to accrue till the next jubilee after the contract, which amounts to the same thing. The true meaning of Ex. xxi 21, is, that because the services of the servant were profitable to his master, the *presumption* was, that the latter did not kill him with a murderous *intent.* Such is the spirit of the whole context—vide v. d. 13, 14, 19, 26, 27. The Hebrew phrase 'throughout the term,' is never intended to express *eternal* duration, except where the subject matter treated of is such as to show that fact; as a critical examination of all the passages in the Old Testament where the phrase occurs, will prove. Though the phrase is always the same, yet there are many different kinds of *'terms'* mentioned in the Old Testament, as the context of each quotation will demonstrate.—Also, the Hebrew word *(Ebed)* rendered *'bond men,* and 'bond-maids,' &c. in Lev. xxv 44, 46, is the common noun for *'servants,'* in all other parts of the Old Testament. The Greeks and Romans who practised slavery extensively, had *words* in their languages, corresponding exactly with our words 'slaveholders' and 'slaves.' But the Hebrew language has no such words; a most strange and unaccountable circumstance, on the supposition that slavery was *common* in Israel, as it must have been if God ordained it there. The candid inquirer after christian truth, ought to be acquainted with these matters; for as Mr. Crothers well remarks, Roman Catholic corruption has crept even into the translation of the Scriptures.

In construing laws of any description, the most universal rule of construction is, their *spirit* and *reason,* (vide 1st Blac. Com. 61;) that is, the *object* or *cause* of the making of the law, proposed to be construed. The correct use of this great rule will help us much, to the correct understanding of the true nature and character of the Hebrew Servitudes. They were expressly provided *for the comfortable support of the poor,* as our poor laws are. No other

special reason is given for their enactment, either in the texts quoted or in any part of the Bible, except in the case of the thief sold to make restitution. And the copious context already quoted shows, by the mild and merciful treatment the slaves were to receive, by the liberality with which they were to be rewarded and their wants supplied, by the extensive and beneficial rights they were invested with, but above all, by the stern injunctions for their freedom, at the years of release and jubilee, that there could not have been any other special reason in any case, except the one above excepted. The Servitudes were also intended to be *types* of the Messiah and his dispensation—vide Gen. xiv 18, Rom. viii 29, Col. 15, 18, Heb. vii 1, 17, viii 5, ix 7, 24, x 1, and other passages. Besides, we should argue from the spirit of the *system*, of which the rule to be criticised forms a part; that is, in doubtful cases we should, in comparing the doubtful text with the context, observe the *general* effect and tendency of the whole context, and decide according to that tendency; always taking care to lean in favor of equity, justice and liberty. With the light of this correct and most useful rule to guide him, it will be impossible for any honest person to believe, that in a Book of Divine Revelation, which enjoins the practice of righteousness and justice in almost every page, the Almighty intended to establish or permit the most unrighteous and unjust practice in existence.

After the creation, God made a grant of the dominion of *ownership* or property over the earth, the brute creation, and all inferior things, to *man, generally*, (vide Gen. i 26, 28, Ps. viii 5,-8;) thus proclaiming at the commencement, that ALL men alike have a right *to hold property*. This doctrine strikes at the root of slavery; because slaves being themselves property, can hold none. In another respect also, the law of slavery directly contradicts the Law of God; for if mankind are by God placed OVER the inferior works of his hands, how can they be lawfully classed *with* them? Thus the reducing of *human* beings to the condition of *property*, is direct blasphemy. For the Almighty never made any grant of the dominion of *property to any part of the human species over another*. Not the least evidence of any such grant can be found in the Bible; nor is there any thing in nature which indicates it. The dominion of *civil* and *family* government were ordained by God, for the preservation and education of families, the *protection* of rights, and the services of religion. And the dominion of tyrannical rule was sometimes threatened in the Scriptures, as a *punishment* for national sins. But the dominion of *property* or ownership in *man*, being totally destructive of all his rights, is declared by the Law of God to be a crime punishable with death. The general grant of property in inferior things also proves, that all men have a DIVINE right to reside on any part of the globe they please. How often is it said, that the American negroes and other colored people, ought to be transported to Africa, and that they have *no right* to freedom and a residence in their native land.—Whereas every colored person in the world has a right given to him by his MAKER, to reside in America or any where else, and in the full enjoyment of all his other rights. He has a DIVINE right to live where he pleases. The pretence is therefore not only false but blasphemous. It is also absurd; because if carried out, it goes to deny the right of every man to a residence any where, except where others *say* he ought to reside! The proud whites of this guilty country, would probably dislike to have it said, that they had *no right* to reside in Europe or Africa, or any other place which false pretenders might please to except. They would resent the pretence as an insult to their common sense; as the colored people of this country resent the pretensions of the Colonization Society. I could proceed in a similar way, to show at great length, how slavery either directly or indirectly conflicts to some extent or other, with every other rule of the Law of Revelation. But it is presumed, that what has been written is abundantly sufficient, to prove beyond all reasonable doubt and controversy, that slavery is one of the greatest of crimes or sins against that holy Law, as it is revealed in the Scriptures.

I next proceed to show, that slavery is one of the greatest of crimes against the *Law of Nature*.

The Law of Nature, technically so called, is the Law of God, as discovered and seen thro' the medium of *His Works*. The indications afforded by the *nature* of men and things around us, and the nature of the relations they sustain to each other, unveil its principles, and enable us to demonstrate and classify many of its rules very clearly. It is sometimes denominated the '*Natural fitness of Things*,' and sometimes '*Utility*,' and by other names. When properly

defined as applicable to the regulation of human conduct, it is, *certain rules of human action, of the greatest fitness and propriety in comparison with others, to produce the greatest amount of human happiness.* Whatever rules of conduct are the *most useful*, belong to the Law of Nature. All virtuous impulses are sure indications of these rules; though vicious ones are not, but the reverse; and yet as the former always precede the latter, it is generally easy for virtuous minds, to distinguish the true rules of this great Law. In such minds, an enlightened *conscience* is the almost infallible guide. In general, whatever is most natural and at the same time *most useful*, is a rule of the Law of Nature. So if any mode of action *end* or terminate well, we may be sure it is a rule of this Law. Many of these rules are so natural and obvious, that men left to their own free agency and without any great temptation to error, instinctively pursue them. This is strictly true of the *most important* rules. This is the principal reason, of the great excellence of the rules of the Common Law so called, most of which grew up as it were with the common people; and hence the common saying, that 'Common Law is Common Sense.' This is also the cause, of the excellence of the laws of the ancient Germans, so much admired by Tacitus and Montesquieu. And whatever of excellence we find in the laws and customs of heathen nations, who have been without the light of the Law of Revelation, is derived from the great Law of Nature. And the superior excellence of the laws and customs of christian nations, is owing to the presence of the greater light of the Law of Revelation. The Law of Nature is abundantly recognized as the Law of God, and its obligations enforced as such, in the Scriptures—vide Gen. i 31, Ps. viii, 3—8, xix 1—4, civ 1—31, cxi 2—8, John ix 3, Acts. xiv 17, xvii 24—28, 1st Cor. xi 14, and many other passages. Wherever the *works* of God are appealed to in the Scriptures, the Law of Nature is alluded to. But though the Scriptures recognize this great Law, and represent it as consonant with the Law of Revelation, (as it strictly is); they yet inform us that it is very *dim* and uncertain; vide Job v 9, ix 4—10, xxxvii 14—23, Ps. xl 5, Rom. xi 33, 1st Cor. i 21, 1st Tim. vi 16, and other passages. It is alluded to in Rom. ii 14; where it intimated, that the Law of Nature *may be* pursued to advantage. And crimes against this Law are reprobated in the Scriptures; vide Lev. xviii 21—30, xx 23, Deut. xviii 9, Rom. i 26, Eph. v 12, Jude 10, and other passages.—All crimes against the Law of Revelation are also crimes against this Law; though this fact will not appear in several cases, without considerable study and information. And we are informed in the Scriptures, that this Law is so blind and dubious, (Acts. xvii 30,) that the greatest allowances will be made by the Creator and final Judge, for the conduct of men destitute of the Law of Revelation. All human experience has confirmed the truth of this alleged uncertainty of this great Law.

As we discover the laws of Matter by experiment and observation, so we discover the rules of the great Law of Nature, (sometimes called the Rules of Morality or Natural Religion or the Religion of Nature,) by the same means. Some of these rules are very plain; others exceedingly obscure. And owing to this obscurity, the heathen moralists who had no other light to guide them, and who made the greatest advances in the physical sciences, differed greatly among themselves, on many most important points of morality. This Law is in fact so obscure, that had it not been for *express* revelation, all human codes must have consisted of most wretched rules of action. As it is, the best codes are bad enough *with* express revelation, and must have been much worse without it, as all heathen codes and systems of laws will testify. Many christian codes are also excessively corrupt, owing to the abuses and perversions of christianity. The Law of Revelation is so plain, copious and perfect, that nothing more is necessary to make the most perfect human codes, than to infuse the spirit of it into all human legislation. And the only reason why there is so much imperfection and wickedness in so many christian codes, is the neglect or the perversion of this spirit.

But though some rules of human conduct are very obscurely indicated in the Law of Nature, there are others of the greatest importance that are very plain. And the benevolence of the Deity is strongly exhibited by the fact, that the *most* important rules are the most clearly indicated. For instance: *this Law clearly indicates or teaches, the natural republican equality of all mankind* who have arrived to years of discretion. The facts, that adult persons by nature possess nearly equal abilities, capacities and wants both bodily and mental; that they have

the same desires for the possession and use of their natural rights; the same capacity to understand and use them properly; the same disposition to vindicate their security, resent their infringement and deplore their loss; and the same necessity for their possession and use, to secure the equal prosperity and happiness of all, exist to prove *clearly*, that these rights belong to all men alike, as their original inheritance from the bounty of their Creator. On the other hand, the striking fact, that the diminution of public and private happiness, is exactly in proportion as the natural rights are imperfectly understood and unequally distributed; and above all, the total annihilation of rational happiness, security and tranquillity, where a majority or a large proportion of the community, are wholly deprived of all rights by slavery, proves, that all human oppression and especially slavish oppression, is wholly unnatural and destructive to human happiness, and therefore a most flagrant transgression of the Law of Nature. *Nature*, so to speak, has created no monarchy, nor aristocracy, nor slavery, nor other tyranny, nor even servitude without full compensation, *among adults*. The subjection of children to their parents, or in lieu thereof of wards to their guardians, and to a small extent, of wives to their husbands, are indicated as rules of this Law. But as a wonderful mark of the benevolence of the Creator, and as if to show that He has forbidden all tyranny, or *abuse* of the power which this subjection confers, and all other tyranny whatever, He has united with these relations, the strongest *natural love* and *affection*. And excepting these two cases of husband and wife, and parent and child or guardian and ward, all the human government in the world, is founded either on contract or usurpation

Slavery of the human species, is not indicated at all. No man is *by nature* born a slave; nor ever becomes one, except by means of criminal force and violence. All men are born *equally* free. Nor is any man born a master. No child is born with a fetter on his heel or a whip in his hand, or with a disposition to submit to either. All the laws and customs of slavery, are therefore mere wicked usurpations and impositions, in contempt and opposition to the Law of Nature. The natural rights are a part of every person's identity. Their allowance and respect is *natural* to all virtuous persons; and they are never infringed without a consciousness of crime, except by habitual transgressors. Human Slavery is not a natural but a *voluntary* evil, the work of wicked men's wicked invention; and is therefore a great crime or sin, against this great and holy Law.

Brute slavery is clearly indicated. The facts, that brutes have too little reason to be useful unless they are enslaved, and that they have just intelligence enough to be useful if they are enslaved; that their bodies are fitted for slavish uses; that they have slavish natures, and that man alone has reason enough to enslave them, and improve their servitude to the highest advantage, both to himself and them; and that when well used, they are actually 'better off' in a state of slavery than of freedom, all demonstrate, that brutes were designed to be slaves, and slaves to man their master. In this respect the Law of Nature exactly coincides with that of Revelation.

We may readily know that human slavery is a great and plain breach of the Law of Nature, by observing the constant misery and destruction of human happiness it produces, to all who are in any way concerned or affected by its operation. *Nature* revolts at human slavery, and is always at open war with it. All slaves are in a constant state of secret if not open rebellion. And this is so well understood by their neighbors, that all slave countries keep in a constant state of preparation and guard against it. The fact also appears, from the most *unnatural*, wicked, barbarous and bloody means necessary for the support of slavery. There is not a crime acknowledged to be such even by heathens and barbarians, who never had any other light but that of nature to guide them, but what is daily and hourly perpetrated in all slave countries, for the support of the abomination. Unnatural violence, threats, oaths and blasphemy, assaults and batteries, mayhem and murder, and cruelties of every description, are the daily and hourly concomitants, of this most nefarious iniquity. Nothing can be more abundant than the proof of these dreadful facts. Let Mr Jefferson be the only witness called for the present. "There must doubtless," says this great man, in his notes on Virginia, "be an unhappy influence on the manners of the people, produced by the existence of slavery among us. The whole commerce between the master and slave, is a perpetual exercise of the most boist-

[illegible]rous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one [illegible], and degrading submission on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it; for man is an imitative animal. The parent storms; the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives loose to the worst of passions; and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy, who can retain his morals and manners undepraved, in such circumstances."

So the Law of Nature enacts *opposition* to slavery and other crimes. It is the *natural* impulse of all virtuous and uncorrupted minds, to resist and punish violations of Nature's laws. And this impulse is as natural and irresistable, as the perception of those laws is clear in such minds. All honest minds revolt at the spectacle of slavish oppressions. They instinctively take sides with the injured party, and long to punish the aggressor. Hence people unused to slave cruelties, are greatly shocked at their first exhibition; and only become hardened to them, by witnessing frequent repetitions. And this instinctive indignation kindled by such cruelties in virtuous bosoms, is a clear proof of the *natural* sinfulness of slavery, or, of its violation of the Law of Nature. Hence also the reason, why children and youth are *natural* abolitionists. It is only by long exposure to the hardening influences of slavery, that they become callous to their *natural* sense of justice and humanity.

The Law of Nature impels all uncorrupted minds to resist slavery, and rescue oppressed persons from bondage. This impulse is so natural, that few can resist it, before they have become hardened to the sufferings of their fellow men. Such too is the plain precept of the Law of Revelation. If man oppresses his fellow man, and especially if he *enslaves* him, *God* renders it our imperative duty, to take the part of the person injured; vide Prov. xxxi 8, 9, and a thousand other passages, that plainly teach this doctrine, both by precept and example. The pretence therefore, that the slavish oppressions of this country are "none of the business" of the abolitionists, is open blasphemy.

Many persons when inveighing against the abolition enterprise, argue as if they supposed slavery to be some *necessary* evil, and as if there was some *natural* cause for it, as in the case of brute slavery. While others as M'Duffie, Bellinger &c., have had the blasphemous audacity to assert, that it is *consistent* with nature, and therefore 'a practical blessing'; 'the corner stone of our republican edifice &c.' Whereas no such pretended or supposed necessity exists, either for the commencement or the continuance of slavery. The Law of Nature which is discovered wholly by natural indications, contains no statute or rule for the enslavement of *human* beings. No one human being is born a slave, or with a greater tendency or propensity to slavery, than another. Liberty is as *natural*, as necessary and as useful, to one as to another; to the black man as to the white; and is absolutely necessary to all human beings to fulfil all the duties indicated to rational beings by nature, as well as by the express commands of God. There is the same necessity of perfect freedom, to promote the happiness of one race of men as another. The nature and value of Human Rights are as easily understood, as highly appreciated, as earnestly desired, and as readily [illegible] by one as the other. And every sophistical argument that can be employed, to justify the enslavement of black people, applies with equal force, if it can be truly said to have any force, to that of white or other coloured ones. The same blasphemous pretences that are used to uphold slavery in this country, are used with the same effect in Russia and Turkey. There is not the slightest difference in their application. The Law of Nature which is the Law of God revealed in His Works and Providence only, is wholly republican in its structure and operation, and vindicates the natural equality of Human Rights, as clearly as the Law of God revealed in His Word does. In fact, the enslavement of *human* beings of any race or description, is NOT a natural, but an artificial, factitious, voluntary evil, and of course a crime or sin committed in defiance, contempt and breach of the Law of God, clearly revealed both in His Word and Works, and of which there is no *natural* necessity, for a single day's continuance. It would be no more false or blasphemous, to call [illegible] a natural evil than slavery, [illegible] being no more indicated by nature than the former. [illegible] the Law of Nature [illegible] *unnatural* or [illegible]

ous, wicked and destructive means are always necessary for its support. The means used to commit murder are not more unnatural. It is as impossible to commit the crime of *slavery* without the use of criminal means, as it is that of murder or any other acknowledged crime. The *natural* evils such as disease, sickness, pain, death &c., are what we *cannot avoid;* and we are compelled to suffer them, whether we will or not. But no man was ever yet compelled to support or suffer slavery himself, in the exercise of his free agency, any more than he was to support murder or any other crime ; which clearly shows that slavery is not a natural evil, or 'blessing'. It is a *voluntary* 'necessity' only that upholds slavery. The pretences therefore of Gov. M'Duffie and others, that slavery is an institution indicated by *nature* and good policy, and therefore just and right, are as false and scandalous as they are dangerous and wicked. Slavery requires the aid of almost every crime *against* the Law of Nature, but derives no support from this great and holy Law itself.

I ought here to add, that the Law of God renders all the Natural Rights *inalienable*, and unforfeitable for any thing but the commission of crimes. It does this by enjoining the *continual* practice of duties, and of course the continual exercise of those rights. As we have no right to omit the constant discharge of those duties, so we have no right to part with the means (our Natural Rights) of enabling us to discharge them ; for if we had such a right, we should also have the right to neglect all the duties enjoined on us by our Maker ; which is absurd. The possession and use of our natural and other just rights, is thus as much our *Divine* duty, as right and privilege ; and if we or others alienate or infringe them, except for the commission of crimes, we rob God as well as man, and commit one of the greatest of crimes. This is the true doctrine of the inalienable nature of Human Rights ; which can never be infringed without crime, except upon forfeiture *by* crime. It is unnecessary to quote passages from the Bible, to show that all manner of overt crimes are punishable in this world, according to their various demerits, with the deprivation of the natural rights of security, liberty, property, safety and even life. The Law of Nature indicates the same deprivation, for the same guilty causes. *Self defence* is commonly and correctly stated to be, the *first* law of Nature. When attacks are made on the peace and safety of society by crimes, it *naturally* and justly puts this law in force, in depriving the criminal of the power of doing further mischief, by taking from him such a portion of his natural rights, as may be necessary for that purpose.

Some corruptionists neglecting the Law of God entirely, attribute no higher a derivation to rights, than a *human* source ; contending in order to justify the abomination of slavery, that men have no rights except what they derive from each other ; that is, from laws, customs and constitutions made by *men*. This is also the common mistake of many honest persons, who suppose all our rights are derived from the *governments* under which we live ; and that men have no rights except what they acquire in this way. That a certain class of infidels, should, for the sake of slavery, raise this pretence, was to be expected ; but for christians to harbor it for a moment, is as absurd as it is sinful. For as has been abundantly shown, all our just Rights, like our lives, our reason and other faculties and powers, and our enjoyments, are the GIFT OF GOD ; and like our other blessings, are to be always used agreeably to the precepts of His holy Law. There is not however much danger, that this blasphemous heresy, the only tendency of which is to destroy the free exercise of all rights, and overthrow all republican freedom and institutions, will gain extensive allowance. Society is much too enlightened for its general encouragement. As our rights are the gift of our Maker, in the manner already stated, all human governments, laws, customs, constitutions and institutions which annul or infringe them, are mere blasphemous usurpations and impositions, and have no moral force or obligation whatever. Liberty and rights being *good* and necessary for the welfare of mankind, are the *gifts* of God, (vide James i 17,) and whatever power violates them, violates and abuses God's gift. Both the Word and the Works of God proclaim the existence and inalienable nature of Human Rights ; and for men to deprive each other of them for any cause except crime, is a most blasphemous violation of God's Law. Governments and laws are established, not to *give*, but to protect and vindicate rights. And when their end is so perverted as to produce a contrary effect, they are radically corrupt, and need radical reformation.

I have heard it asserted, that the doctrine of the *Supremacy* of the Law of God over those of

men. was a dangerous doctrine, and that the preaching of it ought to be prohibited. This is maintained by infidels, for the sake of slavery and other crimes. That this doctrine is very dangerous to *slavery* and all other crimes, is admitted. Otherwise, it is the only sure foundation of true liberty in the world. Annihilate this doctrine, and despotism will soon reign triumphant every where. For if our rights are derived from *God*, and are inalienable by *His* laws, the majority of men have *no right* to deprive the minority of them; and least if possible, have the minority or a single despot a right to usurp rights. And whoever does so, without crime in the person deprived to justify the deprivation, commits a breach of the Divine Law, is guilty of mere usurpation of Divine rights, which may lawfully and justly be resumed at any time.—But if our rights are derived wholly from *men*, and *their* wills are the just measure of Human Rights, the majority or any minority that can usurp the supreme power, may *justly* make any laws, customs and constitutions whatever, and justly oppress the rest of mankind as much as they please! There will be no Human Rights whatever, except the rights of the strongest party, and such other rights and such only, as they think fit to allow. There can be no such thing as injustice in the strongest party; for to admit that there could be, is to admit a higher standard of right and wrong than their own wills. According to this theory, all the tyrants the world ever saw, stand completely justified; such is the horrible result to which this infidel doctrine leads.—If Human Rights are not derived from God, they are not *His gifts*, and neither majorities nor minorities are accountable for their abuse. The mob or any other tyrants may *justly* trample on the rights of individuals with impunity. To such shocking consequences or rather absurdities, does this blasphemous heresy lead. The true doctrine as already proven is, that the majority have no right to trample on the Divine or *natural* rights of the minority, in any way. If they do, they are accountable to God for such abuse of power, and will be surely punished for the abuse, both here and hereafter. Our just rights are all derived from our Maker, who having commanded us to exercise them continually, it must be a blasphemous crime to take them away from any body, except upon forfeiture for crimes.

I will here notice another very dangerous heresy, which has frequently been adopted by learned and good men. It is the doctrine, that when men enter into society and submit to civil government, they *abandon a part* of their natural rights. Many plausible pretences are set up, to justify this false doctrine, which we need not take up room to criticise, for the falsity of the doctrine is nearly self evident. Common sense teaches us all, that we unite in civil societies, to gain *more* security, *more* liberty and *more* property and other privileges, than we can enjoy in a state of nature or natural society as it is called, without any union, government or laws to protect us. Governments and laws are or ought to be made, to protect the *whole* of the rights of their subjects; not to annul or diminish them. The great object and end of all political society and organization, is or ought to be, to preserve men's rights entire. Very true it is, that this great end is generally perverted by wicked people and rulers, and all societies and governments thereby rendered more or less imperfect and oppressive. But this is not the fault of the original design of such institutions, as enjoined by their Divine Author. We have no authority from Him to abuse any of His gifts. And if we are careful to separate the abuses of civil government from the institution itself, we shall soon discover, that its great and only object, its *Divine* purpose is, to secure in full exercise, all the just rights that men possess as the gift of their Creator.

I proceed lastly to show, that human slavery is a great crime against the *Common Law*.

This is easily done; because it is so easy for people who live under the protection of that law, to see how and why and when *their own* rights are invaded, and how it is that those rights are protected and vindicated. They have only to place the slaves in their own situation or themselves in the place of the slaves, in imagination, and the work of instruction is almost needless.

The Common Law so called, is that great collection of rules and maxims of human action and conduct, contained in the books of Reports and elementary legal treatises, which compose the libraries of lawyers, (vide 1 Blac. Com. 71); and being as I have already hinted, derived in part from the Law of Nature, and consonant with that great Law in its general spirit, is undoubtedly the most perfect *human* code extant. It first commenced in Germany in very ancient times; was thence introduced into England by the Anglo Saxons, whence it was introduced into this country by its early settlers, and is here the customary code of the country, in the same sense that the English language, manners and customs are customary. Montesquieu says it is the only system of human law, that has civil liberty for its principal object; and we ought therefore to esteem it as our rich inheritance. Its general spirit admirably agrees with the precepts of the Bible; and whatever imperfections it possesses, are derived from the encroachments of *aristocracy*, (which has to some degree moulded it,) on the natural rights. Aristocracy, of which the practice of slavery is the highest grade, will always where it has the power, encroach on just laws as it does on just rights. The aristocratical blemishes of the Common Law, are repugnant to the nature of our republican principles and institutions, and as such are generally rejected in this country; while all its just, equitable principles are retained and used, except in the case of the poor slaves. So far as regards the *rights*, safety and happiness of these unfortunate people, the Common Law is annihilated, and a perfect despotism substituted in its stead. The slave derive no protection

from it whatever; and so far as it is used in relation to them at all, if in any way, it is used only for their oppression. They are subjected to many of its liabilities, but suffered to enjoy none of its privileges.

This great and excellent law, guarantees to all human beings within its jurisdiction and under its protection, the free use of all their natural rights, in the highest perfection; vide 1 Blac. Com. 144. No person can infringe any of these rights in the least degree, by any *overt* act, without a plain breach of that law, which affords adequate remedies to redress injuries received, from almost every breach that can occur. Thus criminal threats and menaces, assaults and batteries, kidnapping and false imprisonment, which are the component parts of slavery, are all indictable offences at common law, and severely punishable by it; vide 4 Blac. Com. 217, 218. It also gives private or civil remedies in compensatory and vindictive damages, for the wrongs and sufferings of the injured party; vide 3 Blac. Com. 120, 132. It affords a summary and immediate remedy for false imprisonment, by *Habeas Corpus;* vide 3 Blac. Com. 130; and a preventive remedy for injuries threatened, called '*swearing the peace*'; vide 4 Blac. Com. 256. In short, the remedies provided by this great and excellent law, for all cases of Human Oppression, are numerous, ample and satisfactory, however imperfectly, owing to the imperfection of human agency, they may in some cases be administered.

Slavery is not a crime against the common law, *by that name;* any more than Tyranny is. It is called in that law' '*Assault and Battery and False Imprisonment,*' (4 Blac. Com. 217, 218); and is severely punishable by that law, according to the aggravated degree of the offence, by fine and imprisonment. Were this crime to be committed against any free person, living under the jurisdiction and protection of the Common Law, with circumstances of cruelty attending the mildest forms of American Slavery, and were the offender to be punished with the full rigor of this law, it would cost him every thing short of his life. So too the crime of *Kidnapping*, (4 Blac. Com. 219,) the severest punishment of the same kind, is by the common law meted out to the offender. *Kidnapping* is by the general consent of society, considered as one of the most atrocious crimes against the rights of *white* people; as the Morgan affair and other cases prove. But in reference to the rights of the coloured people, it is considered by the public sentiment of this corrupt country, hardly any offence at all! Thousands of free coloured persons, some of them at the seat of the Federal government, have been kidnapped and sold and perished in hopeless slavery, and the practice has been generally treated, as a business not deserving of serious notice!

Slavery is also the highest species of *Robbery;* and is as much worse than *common* robbery, as all the natural rights put together, are more valuable than personal goods and chattels. Common Robbery is defined to be, 'the taking of goods and chattels from the person of another, *by putting him in fear*'; vide 4 Blac. Com. 242. Slavery takes from slaves *all* their natural rights, *by the same means;* and is therefore real robbery of the highest kind. It takes from its victims all their Security, Liberty, Property and other Rights together, *by putting and keeping the slaves in fear.* Constant fear and terror are the only agents used to uphold the iniquity. At Common Law, slaveholders are all criminals, of different kinds and in various degrees. Thousands of them are felons deserving of capital punishment, for the crimes of rape, robbery, mayhem and murder, committed on the persons of their helpless slaves; or, as having been accessories to those crimes; vide 4 Blac. Com. 195, 206, 210 &c. And when they shall be *treated* as felons and criminals, by a reformed public sentiment, as they ought to be, then and not till then, will they repent and reform from the sin of slavery.

By the Common Law, if the *consideration* of a contract fail, the contract is void. Now were a man to sell himself for a *slave*, the consideration of the sale *must* fail; for as a slave can own no property, (he not having a *right* to own any,) the money or other consideration would, as well as the slave himself, belong to the master only. This fact shows, that all *voluntary* slave sales are void at Common Law; vide 1 Blac. Com. 424. And this is one reason why by that law, all human rights are inalienable. By that law, the consideration of a sale of any description, must move *to* and be vested *in*, the lawful seller himself. Otherwise, the contract is void. *Involuntary* sales of men, are not only a high crime against the common law, as already stated, but the considerations of them are never vested in the persons sold. They are simple acts of high handed robbery at Common Law. Such is the nature at Common Law, of every slave sale ever made in the United States!

The whole system of the Common Law is founded on a series of *Maxims*, which being in strict harmony with the Law of God, have never been excelled for wisdom, justice and equity. But slavery breaks and annuls them all. Thus it is a maxim of that law, that '*we should so use our own rights, as not to injure those of others*'; vide 3 Blac. Com. 217, 1st Cor. vii 31, ix 18.—But most of the white people of this country who have had the power, have been in the habit of using or rather abusing, all their just powers, faculties, rights and privileges, to the wrong and injury of the coloured people. This conduct is the settled custom of the slave states, and is more or less exhibited in the free states. Hardly any body till lately, has imagined it any thing wrong and sinful. The most respectable people in society, grave judges and legislators, literary men, gentlemen and ladies, and even pious ministers of the gospel, with the Bible and the rules

and maxims of the common law in their hands, have all united to use their own rights and powers, to enslave and otherwise oppress the coloured population; or, simply in using their own rights to injure and destroy those of the slaves. The principal cause or pretext of this conduct has been, the operation of the great slave maxim, that 'slaves have no rights', not even to the benefit and protection of legal maxims. Legal justice has thus given place to legal injustice, which has rendered the slaves all outlaws, in a professedly *free* country! Another great and excellent maxim is, that '*no man shall take advantage of his own wrong.*' But the slaveholders and their friends and supporters, take every wicked advantage of their own wrongs, to perpetuate slavery and abuse the slaves. They deprive the slaves of freedom, and then *because* they are thus deprived, continue to enslave them. They brutalize, corrupt and degrade the slaves, and then pretend they are unfit for freedom, and so ought to remain in slavery. They deprive them of all literary knowledge, and then pretend they are too ignorant to make a proper use of rights, and ought therefore to remain deprived of them. They deprive them of all the ordinary means of grace, and correct knowledge of duty, and then pretend they are too vicious to be trusted with liberty. They enslave and brutalize them to that degree, that they are as they pretend, wholly unfit for freedom, and then *because* they are thus unfit, they refuse to liberate them! In short, to use a homely metaphor, 'they tie their feet, and then blame them because they cannot walk.' In the spirit of the slaveholding contempt of this maxim, is the pretence of the *necessity* of slave laws &c. I once heard a person insist on the necessity and praise the excellence, of the slave laws and customs of Georgia and other slave states in which he had lived. This made me think of the necessity and excellence of the regulations of Nero and Robespierre; for those monsters had or pretended to have, *laws* to justify their wholesale murder with. First, by means of one great crime (slavery), produce the necessity for other crimes (slave laws and customs) to support it, and then plead this necessity in their justification! With such blasphemous sophistry are all tyrannical laws, customs and authority supported. Criminal necessity, a necessity produced by his own crimes, is every tyrant's plea. Slavery is one crime, and slave laws and customs are other crimes used to support man-stealing; and the only necessity and excellence they have, is in the facility and security they furnish, for the commission of this great crime. It is another maxim, that '*none are bound by contracts or laws, but parties and privies to them.*' But the slaves are never considered as parties to any law or contract, they not having the right to make either; nor are they ever privies, any more than brutes are. And yet they are held responsible to the laws; and are bound by all contracts made respecting them by others. It is another maxim, that '*every wrong shall have its remedy.*' But slave wrongs have no remedies. No slave is ever allowed any legal redress, for the daily and hourly civil and criminal injuries he receives. He is never permitted to sue in a court of law, because he has no such right. He is wholly unprotected and defenceless. The law which is a shield to others, is to him a scourge only. He is an outlaw or without the protection of law; and without crime on his part, in his own native land. If he offends against law which he had no agency in making, he is subjected to the penalties of the most barbarous slave code that ever existed; but if others offend against *him*, he is without redress! He has all the responsibilities of the law, without any of its protection. I might in the same manner proceed to show, how slavery in its operation on the slaves, tramples on every other righteous maxim and rule of the Common Law, for the sake of wronging and abusing the slaves. But the subject is too plain to need any further illustration.

Thus too I might proceed to particularize, and show how slavery tramples on, crushes, and wholly annuls, all the inferior subordinate rights of the slaves, clearly belonging to them at Common Law; such as the right to apply to courts of justice for redress of civil injuries; the right to petition for redress of grievances; the right to acquire education; the right of conscience; the right to bear arms, &c. But this would be superfluous; because, '*slaves have no rights.*'—This blasphemous maxim tramples on the whole common law, and annuls the application of it to the case of slaves.

I have now proved, that slavery is not only a great crime against the Common Law, but that it is utterly hostile to its *spirit* and *genius*. The Common Law is extremely republican in its structure; its general rules and maxims are in the highest degree equal, just and equitable; while slavery its antagonist is pure unmixed despotism. The Common Law naturally leads to improvement in the moral and social condition of mankind; while slavery tends only to debase and degrade it. Wherever the Common Law prevails, wise and wholesome statute laws are made from time to time, to remedy its defects and improve the condition of its subjects; but under the despotism of slavery, statutes relative to slaves are seldom made for any other purpose, but to brutalize, oppress and degrade them. Light and darkness, holiness and sin, are hardly more opposed to each other, than the Common Law and Slavery are. They are always direct antagonists; and wherever the one prevails, the other always falls.

Slavery has been legalized in the United States by *custom*. It is a customary, not a constitutional right. But it is a custom which has prevailed in *defiance* of the Common Law. It is a *heathen* custom, originally adopted by *christians*, from the African negroes! Blackstone lays down seven rules as *criteria* for the allowance of all general customs whatever, (vide I Blac. Com. 76—79); of the most of which criteria, all slave customs are direct and scandalous viola-

tions. *They are the worst customs in the world.* They have therefore prevailed in defiance of the great Common Law *maxim*, that '*Bad customs are to be abolished*'—vide 1 Blac. Com. 76.—The Common Law is itself legalized by custom, in its application to the rights of our white population; and most of its rules as thus applied, will bear the test of Blackstone's criteria. But the shameful truth is, that our American judges in deciding upon the allowance of slave customs, have set all those criteria which condemn slavery, wholly aside. Better justice has been usually administered in Algiers by Turkish judges, than by the American Bench to American slaves.

By the Common Law, all slavery is a mere usurpation of right; as is instantly felt whenever the rights of our white people are outraged. By that Law, no property in any thing stolen vests in the thief, or his heirs, *as against the rightful owner.* Neither does its produce or increase ever thus vest. The rightful owner or his heirs, can upon due proof recover them at any time.—So if the thief *sells* the stolen property, neither the buyer or his heirs acquires any title to it, *as against the lawful owner.* By that Law too, every man is under God his own owner; and whoever steals, kidnaps, purchases or enslaves him, can acquire no title to him or his services, or to his posterity, as slaves. It is also a common law maxim, that 'the receiver is as bad as the thief;' which proves that at common law, slave-*holding* is as criminal as slave-trading or kidnapping. By the Common Law all the natural rights are inalienable; because the considerations of their sales and other alienations must fail; no slave having a right to hold those pretended considerations, as before stated; vide 1 Blac. Com. 424. These rules show, that all slave titles are mere wicked usurpations, committed in defiance of the Common Law. All slave laws, customs, authority and titles are ETERNAL WRONGS; and all slave traders and slave holders are among the greatest of criminals, by the Law of God and all just laws of men.

It may be well to remark in conclusion, that by the *Law of Nations*, every sovereign state is entitled to the cultivated services, skill and abilities of all its inhabitants; in order to preserve and perfect itself and its institutions, and promote its highest felicity, ability and glory; vide Vattel, 22, 86—98. So by the same Law, all its inhabitants have the right and duty both, to perfect their skill to the utmost, for the good of their country. But slavery utterly prohibits these effects; and thereby hinders the resources and weakens the defences of every country in which it prevails. Free nations are vastly stronger than slavish ones; as all history shows.—In these and other respects, slavery is also a manifest violation of the spirit of the Law of Nations.

The Common Law doctrine of *Rights* is too important to be omitted in this connexion, and is therefore here added to the foregoing doctrines.

In a country where so much has been *said* about Rights, this notice would seem almost superfluous. For in no other country on the globe, has such noise and parade been made about *Rights*, as in this; about *human* rights, *equal* rights, *natural* rights, *just* rights, *republican* rights, *democratic* rights, *federal* rights, *national* rights, *sacred* rights, *inalienable* rights, '*sailors*' rights,' *American* rights, *Divine* rights, and all other sorts of Rights. And it is probable, that in no other country, have all just rights been more outraged and trampled on; one sixth part of the whole population being deprived of all rights whatever, and constantly exposed to the infliction of every possible wrong and outrage, without responsibility on the part of the oppressors, or redress to themselves. It will be of great use to know distinctly, what these rights *are*, of which these poor people are so unjustly and wickedly deprived.

There are a variety of books that treat of *Human Rights;* especially the legal treatises in the libraries of lawyers. But there are TWO books, which on account of the precision and energy with which they define and vindicate these *Rights*, have obtained a just pre-eminence over others. These are, the HOLY BIBLE and BLACKSTONE'S COMMENTARIES.

Of these two Books, the Bible is by far the most copious and energetic, in its vindication of all just Human Rights. We have already observed the perfection of the Law of Revelation in this respect; and that Law I affirm to be a *perfect* law in all respects; as the most critical examination will prove. Such is its care to protect the just rights of all men, that it is impossible for one man to infringe the just rights of another, without his conduct being condemned in the Bible as a crime, and threatened with the vengeance of the Almighty. Every such violator must offend, if not directly against the letter of some particular precept or command, yet certainly against the whole spirit of the Scriptures; as a critical examination will show. A sufficient number of Scripture passages have been quoted in this Lecture, to raise this presumption already.—And as God's Law reaches to the 'thoughts and intents of the heart', and commands us to 'prove all things', it necessarily must be so. On this account, I have long considered the Bible as the most republican book in the world.

In the first volume of Blackstone's Commentaries, the number, nature and extent of these Rights, are defined and described with great precision,—vide 1 Blac. Com. 129 &c. According to this celebrated author, the Absolute Natural Rights, about the inalienable nature of which so much is said, are THREE in number, viz: 1st, the *right* of PERSONAL SECURITY; 2d, the *right* of PERSONAL LIBERTY, and 3d, the *right* of PRIVATE PROPERTY. All these three great Rights are the gift of God himself, *to every human being;* as is abundantly clear from all parts of the Bible, in the manner already stated; and as the Law of Nature discovered by natural indications, clear-

ly demonstrates. He must have intended this: or He would never have made the use of [illegible] absolutely necessary to all men, to enable them to obey His commands. No person can therefore alienate them from himself or others, or destroy or infringe them, without committing a crime against God's Laws, and without blasphemy of some kind against the Almighty. Nor can they be lawfully taken from any human being, except as a punishment for the commission of crime. Nor can they be lawfully subjected to any human check or control, except so far as to prevent their exercise interfering with their use by others. The whole subject of Human Rights is one of the most important and solemn, that can engage the attention of mankind. Every person in his own case feels that it is so.

The *first* absolute Right or that of PERSONAL SECURITY, consists according to Blackstone in the free and uninterrupted use and enjoyment, of our lives, limbs, bodies, health and reputations.

The *second* absolute Right or that of PERSONAL LIBERTY, consists in the free and uninterrupted privilege of loco-motion, or of going, staying and returning, whither, where, when, and as we please.

The *third* absolute Right or that of PRIVATE PROPERTY, consists in the free and uninterrupted privilege, of acquiring, using, aliening, and disposing of as our own exclusively, all kinds of natural objects or substances except human beings. The express grant of all those things to all mankind alike, (Gen. i 26, 28,) necessarily excludes the right of property or ownership of man in each other.

These three great Absolute Natural Rights belong equally to *all* mankind, whatever their circumstances, ages or relations may be. But there are certain *other* Rights which the greatest part of mankind possess, in consequence of certain *relations* they generally sustain towards each other, and which are thence called *Relative* Rights. These are, the Rights of *husband and wife, of parent and child,* of *guardian and ward,* and of *master and servant;* vide 1 Blac. Com. 123, 422. All these Rights for the reasons before mentioned, are likewise the gift of God and inalienable.

There are two other kinds of Rights, the benefit if not the possession of which belongs to all mankind, and which ought to be possessed and used as just occasion requires, by all persons who can justly and lawfully possess them, and who are capable of using them properly. For the sake of distinction, I will call them *Republican* and *Conventional* Rights.

The first or Republican Rights, are auxiliary or ancillary to the great Absolute Natural Rights being necessary to protect and sustain them in full exercise. These are, the right *to petition government for a redress of grievances;* the right *to apply to courts of justice for redress of injuries;* the right *to bear arms;* the right *of suffrage;* the right *to testify as witnesses;* the right *to serve as jurymen;* the right *to acquire education;* the right *to freedom of speech and the press;* the right *of conscience,* and some others. Most of these rights are secured to the white people of this country, by their *state* constitutions and laws. It is clear that the great Absolute Natural Rights cannot be protected and enjoyed, and would be in constant danger of being infringed and trampled on, without the assistance and support of these minor rights; as the histories of all despotic governments show; and as the conduct of the guilty white people of this country, who are so jealous of their full possession and free exercise, proves. This fact, and the fact that we are by nature capable, on arrival at years of discretion, of their proper exercise, proves by *necessary implication,* that these Rights are also the gift of God, and of course inalienable,—vide 1 Blac. Com. 141. It is a rule of the Common Law, that whenever a contract or other instrument grants *express* powers, all other powers necessary for the exercise and enjoyment of those powers are *implied;* that is, are given by necessary implication, though not mentioned in the instrument. So if a grant be made in a deed, all other rights and privileges necessary to the enjoyment of the grant, are given by the deed, though not named therein,—vide 2 Blac. Com. 30.

The other or Conventional Rights, are such as are acquired by *contract* or agreement with others; such as the right *to marry;* the right *of social intercourse;* the right *to use the services and property of others;* the right *to wages, rent and profit;* the right *to collect our debts,* &c., comprehending a vast variety of cases, corresponding with the agreements mankind make with each other. In this class are also comprehended all *public* or *official* rights: or the rights of public officers, judges, legislators and other *public* persons, derived to them from election, appointment or inheritance. These rights when justly acquired, are as sacredly enforced by the Law of God as other rights: vide Lev. xix 13, Prov. xii 26, Rom. xii 17, 1st Cor. vi 7, 2d Cor. viii 21, Phil. iv 8, 1st Thess. iv 6, 12, Heb. xiii 18, and numerous other passages. *Honesty* is specially enjoined and dishonesty specially condemned, in various parts of the Bible. All Conventional Rights are thus as it were, the gift of God. And at least one of them, the right *to make and execute just contracts,* is inalienable; for the same reason the others are: though some rights acquired by just contract, may in some cases be sold or otherwise alienated, by their rightful owners.

All these Rights taken collectively, make up the sum total of what are called HUMAN RIGHTS. They are so called, because they belong to *human* beings only. To determine whether a being belongs to the human species, and so entitled to these Rights, we have only to observe whether he possesses three qualities, viz: 1st, *Reason:* 2d, *Speech:* and 3d, *Human shape, organization,*

features, faculties and *capacity*. If he have these, he is a perfect human being, is endowed by his Maker with all the foregoing inalienable Human Rights, and it is blasphemous to deprive him of the use of them in any case, except for the commission of crimes. All other human peculiarities and differences have nothing to do with human identity, and are of no consequence as it respects the possession and free exercise of *equal human rights*. *Colour* for instance, though frequently characteristic of large classes of natural objects, has yet no relation to identity in any case It is always an *immaterial* physical peculiarity, whether distinctive or accidental. Nor is *variety* any test of identity. Every race of plants and animals has its varieties; why then should not the human race have its varieties; for analogy requires them? There are said by naturalists, to be *five* distinct races or varieties of the human species, all equally perfect in human identity, though each differs from the rest, in the possession of some immaterial physical peculiarities. Of these the negro or black race is one, possessing all the qualities necessary to identify the human species, in as great perfection as any of the other races. To deprive coloured people of their just human rights then, is a most atrocious crime against the Law of God, as well as against the Common Law.

All the just rights of men being thus the gift of God, are therefore DIVINE rights. And any right which annuls or infringes these natural or Divine rights, is a WRONG, crime or sin; it being simply a blasphemous usurpation of *men*, against the Law of God, and committed in contempt and violation thereof. Such is the *Right of Slavery*, which annuls and tramples on all the Natural Rights, granted to all men by their Maker. Slavery is indeed a most tremendous sin; but like many other abominations, such as murder and idol worship for instance, it has been very common in all barbarous ages and nations. And the fact that more white people are now and always have been, in a state of slavery, than black ones, proves, that slavery is not more *natural* to one race of men than another. It is a heathen and barbarian abomination; and for enlightened christians to tolerate it in the nineteenth century, indicates a degree of moral corruption, that has not I suspect, been surpassed since the times of the Canaanites.

Inanimate objects have no rights, of course. Brutes have too little reason to understand rights, or to use them if they had them; and it is absolutely necessary to enslave them, to render them useful to mankind. Thus does the Law of Nature as well as that of Revelation, devote them to slavery for the benefit of mankind. To treat them with cruelty is highly sinful, (vide Deut. xxv 4, Prov. xii 10,) and in this sense, they may be said to have the right *of humane treatment;* tho' they have not sense enough to redress injuries to it. They are all justly born and used as slaves. But it is impossible to enslave a *human* being of any race or description, without his resenting it as an injury, without a consciousness of wrong by the enslaver, and without a blasphemous violation of the Law of Revelation, the Law of Nature and the Common Law.

It is an inevitable conclusion in honest argument on the subject of Abolition, that *all men* have the *rights* of men, granted to them by their Creator. If therefore negroes are MEN, they ought to be TREATED like men; and not like brutes. It is enough to make every honest person an abolitionist, to know that coloured slaves are MEN. So necessary and unavoidable is this conclusion, that the opposers of abolition when they will condescend to argue at all, are soon compelled to deny the *human* nature of negroes. And I have heard some pretended anatomical facts and other alleged circumstances brought forward, to prove, that though negroes have always been classed in the human species by naturalists, yet they are in fact BRUTES; or at the most, an intermediate link between the human and brute species. And the truth is, we have been so long in the habit of *treating* the coloured people in many respects as brutes, that many white people feel or affect to feel, that they really are a species of the brute creation,—a sort of apes or ourang-outangs. Nothing is more common, than for the supporters of slavery to make this base pretence. It may seem like folly, to attempt to combat such a blasphemous perversion of human reason. But that every 'refuge of lies' used to support slavery may be overthrown, I will treat the subject seriously.

Some contend there is a *regular gradation* of intelligence, from the lowest species of animals up to white men. But this is not true. God gave to man *generally*, dominion over all brute animals; thereby proclaiming the equal *capacity* as well as right, of all men for this purpose. The Law of Nature teaches the same doctrine. Brutes have instinctive reason only; and each class has an instinct *peculiar* to itself; and one instinct has no more 'intelligence' than another, that we know of. Brutes have no moral nor intellectual reason, properly so called; and there is very little difference in their instinctive reason; and none of them possess the faculty of articulate speech. There is no difference in the number, kind and degree of the purely human qualities, among any of the varieties of man. They all possess them in equal perfection. But between man and every species of brutes, there is a wide and impassable gulf of difference, in reason, speech and all their qualities. There is no 'regular gradation' in these respects, between man and brute. It is a broad and plain chasm, intuitively perceptible to the smallest human capacity; and which all men recognize alike, by their instinctive authority over the brute creation.

It is sometimes pretended, that the long continuance of the negro savages of Africa in a state of barbarism, is sufficient to show their utter incapacity for civilization; and that they cannot therefore be *men*. But this argument will prove far too much to be good for any thing. For not

only the African negroes but the Arabs, the Moors, the Hindoos, the Chinese, and the best of the Circassians and Georgians the finest white people in the world, the North American Indians and indeed the great majority of mankind acknowledged to be such, have remained in a state of *barbarism*, as long or longer than the negroes have. The argument goes to prove, that that portion of *mankind* only who are *civilized*, belong to the human race! An Irish syllogism truly. If fully carried out, it will prove that our own remote ancestors were all brutes! Such is the effect of the attempt to make civilization a test of human identity. The black population of Africa have made as great advances in the arts, as most other barbarians have; as the researches of authentic travellers will show. They are as far advanced in the arts, as our own ancestors were in Julius Cæsar's time. And the only reason why they have not become civilized is, because like most other barbarians, they have been cut off by circumstances, from the civilizing influences of civilization. The only influences of it they have ever felt, have been its demoralizing, injurious, wicked influences. Civilization has never been employed to benefit, but to injure Africa.

No argument can be framed to support this absurd hypothesis, but what will contradict itself—a fact that shows the hypothesis itself must be false. And it would seem from the *fact* in the case, that none could be found silly enough to doubt, or wicked enough to pretend to doubt, of the human nature of black people. But as many really do doubt or affect to doubt, in a matter so obvious, I will make some plain inquiries.

In the first place I ask, if negroes are not *men*, what sort of CRIME do those white people commit, who cohabit and amalgamate with them! vide Ex. xxii 19, Lev. xviii 23, xx 15, 16. And in the next place, how happens it that the mixed offspring of this intercourse, have the power of propagating their species? But to drop these indelicate inquiries; why is it that the slaveholders, in their advertisements of slaves sales, auctions and runaways, are in the habit of describing the slaves as black *men*, black *women*, black *boys*, black *girls* and black *children*; or as negro *men*, *women* &c.; and of familiarly conversing with and about them, as black *persons*, black *people*, black *fellwics*, *wenches*, *servants*, *folks*, &c.? For nobody ever thinks of giving these appellations to *real brutes*. Nay, why are they always called *slaves* or *servants*. For brutes are never so called. And why do the laws made for their regulation or rather oppression, call them black and mulatto *persons*, *men* &c.? And why are such laws made at all, or made obligatory on *them*? Laws to regulate brutes, are made obligatory on their owners only. Why then do laws ever inflict *pains*, *penalties* and *punishments* on negroes, if they are not *human* beings? Is it ever necessary to pass laws, to prevent cattle and horses from having the benefit of common schools, hogs from sitting as jurymen, goats from preaching, cats and dogs from voting at the polls, and monkies from practising at the bar or testifying as witnesses? Are laws ever made to try brute animals in courts of justice, or to tax them, or to allow or prohibit their doing anything else, that men only are capable of doing? And would grave and learned legislators render themselves ridiculous, in thus designating or legislating for beings that were in fact *brutes*? Or would such legislators be liable to mistake the real nature of negroes? This is wholly incredible. And why do white people make and execute contracts with negroes, and trust important business to their discretion; and why do governments make treaties with them? And why the propositions to send missionaries to christianize and convert the African negroes, or as Mr. Clay did, recommend American negroes as missionaries for the same purpose? And why is it that black people are found as capable in all trades and employments, and susceptible of as much learning, civilization and refinement, as white ones? And why are they able to frame civil governments, laws and economy, as in St. Domingo? And above all, if negroes really are *brutes*, why the tremendous uproar and din among the slaveholders at the south, and their friends at the north, about the 'incendiary abolition circulars' as they falsely call them, sent as they falsely allege, by the abolitionists among their slaves? And about the 'bloody designs' of the 'wicked and treasonable' abolitionists? Do they or their friends pretend, that these circulars would have any effect on *real* brutes; upon cattle and horses for instance: upon hogs, dogs, cats, sheep, goats, geese, turkies, hens, doves, elephants, lions, tigers, bears, hyenas, jackalls and monkies! Surely the conduct of the slaveholders and their friends, in treating human negroes as human beings, in every respect except as to *rights*, is most ridiculously ridiculous, on the supposition they are not human beings, endowed with all the distinctive qualities, properties and faculties of human beings.

But it may be said, that negroes actually differ from white people. So they do, *in colour*, as black horses, cattle and other animals differ from white ones; and in a few other immaterial physical peculiarities, sufficient to distinguish the races, but not in the least to affect the identity of the species; and of course, not to affect the identity of the rights, which belong to the species as the gift of God. Colour has nothing to do with identity in any other case, then why should it in this? Black men differ from white ones, as red, brown and olive coloured men differ from them, and from each other; that is to say, in a few immaterial physical peculiarities, which do not in the least affect the identity of the species. The anatomical structure, organization and functions of each race and individual of the human species, is precisely similar to those of all the rest, without the slightest material difference. There is no anatomical difference of importance, among any of the races. And there is less difficulty in identifying the human species, in

any case, than in almost any species of brutes. Nor is there any thing artificial that white persons are able to perform, but what black ones with the same means and advantages, are found just as capable of executing. Those who pretend that negroes are not human beings, are obliged to reject the use of common sense. Indeed in a matter so plain and obvious, and about which honest men (and dishonest ones when off their guard) so instinctively agree, notwithstanding the moral corruption and blindness produced by slavery, I have no charity for the pretended sincerity of those, who affect to doubt of the human nature of black people.

It has been said, that the long enslavement of the blacks, though it may not prove them to be actual brutes, yet it shows their great natural inferiority to the whites, and plainly indicates their natural adaptation to *servitude;* and that the pretence, of their ability to equal the whites with the same advantages, is a chimera. Their natural and proper station in society it is said, must be below that of the whites, in *some* way, measure and degree. This reasoning is the effect of the genuine aristocratic prejudice against *condition,* already alluded to in this lecture. The same false pretence is made by aristocrats every where, against those already below them in the scale of aristocratic society, in order to insure the degradation of their inferiors. They argue from the long established *condition* of those below them, that they are inferior *by nature.* That is to say; they take advantage of their own combined oppressions, alias their own wrongs, to degrade the multitude by argument drawn from comparison, *for the sake of keeping them degraded,* prevent their condition from improving, and thus secure their own supremacy in society.—Precisely similar is the conduct of the white people of this guilty country, towards the coloured people. They take the same wicked advantage of their own wrongs, still more to oppress and degrade the coloured race, *for the purpose of keeping them degraded.* They purposely prevent their participating, in the usual fountains and avenues of knowledge and skill, and then falsely pretend they are *naturally* inferior, and so ought and must be, servants or slaves to the white race. Such insulting wickedness will not be forgiven on High, without repentance and reformation. The truth is, there is no natural difference of mental capacity and ability, between the upper and lower classes of society, nor between the different races of mankind, as is sometimes falsely pretended. The natural abilities of the one are as good as those of the other. Education and other means of improvement, have made all the difference. The black race is in no respect naturally inferior, to the white or any other race. The difference in the *condition* of the two races in this country, has been produced wholly by wicked, artificial means.

And if the *condition* of the coloured people be still appealed to, as a proof of their *natural* inferiority; and that they are as has often been alleged, prone to slavery, easily broke to the yoke &c.; let those who make the allegations, please to answer the following inquiries. What did the condition of the *white* slaves, of ancient Greece and Rome prove? What does the condition of the millions of *white* slaves, now in modern Russia, Turkey and Poland prove? What does the practice of the *white* barbarians of Circassia and the countries adjacent, the handsomest white people in the world, of selling their own children for slaves prove? What does the slavery of caste, among the Hindoos and other oriental nations prove? What did the slavery of villenage in ancient England prove? What did the practice of our British and other European ancestors, who in ancient Feudal times, bought and sold each other for slaves prove? And what does the fact, that there is a greater number of white than of black slaves, now in the world prove? And if *all* the tendency to slavery exists in the black race, how has it happened, that there has ALWAYS been since the commencement of authentic history, far more white than black slaves in the world! When these and other similar inquiries are satisfactorily answered, it may be proper and profitable to pursue these interesting inquiries, respecting the *brutal* and SLAVISH nature of black people.

Thus has it been proven beyond the possibility of an honest doubt, that slavery is as great a crime against the Law of God, as murder or any other crime, and that it is a great crime against the Common Law. And such being clearly the fact, it will naturally be asked, how it was *possible* so great and so plain a sin, could become customary among christian nations.—I answer; the practice was first adopted and introduced among christians, by reprobate men in imitation of the heathen; and was afterwards sanctioned and legalized, by wicked *perversions* of certain parts of the Scriptures. *Authentic history proves this fact clearly.* The inquiry will also be made, whether slavery has not been a *sin of ignorance.* I answer, no; it is not possible it should have been such a sin among Christians. There never was a time since the introduction of christianity, when this was possible *among christian people.* The case is too plain and manifest to admit of such a possibility, among christians, with the Bible in their hands and favored with gospel privileges. It might as well be pretended, that murder, theft and robbery, *can be* 'sins of ignorance' among such people. Murder by religious persecution, by offensive war, by duelling and other wicked means, has been very common among christian nations. But it has never been a sin of *ignorance,* because all christians must or might have known better. We see in the numerous passages quoted from the Old Testament, that the Jews were *always* punished, when they broke the Law without repentance; and that repentance and reformation only ever prevented such punishment. Such penitence only suspends the Divine displeasure, and averts the infliction of Divine judgments.—vide Jer xviii 7—10 xxvi 3, and many other passages.—

Hence we argue with infallible certainty, that unless our own guilty nation repents and reforms from the sin of slavery, it will in the course of Divine providence be dreadfully scourged therefor. We see also from the numerous passages quoted, that the Jews were never excused from punishment, because their priests and false prophets *perverted* the law, and led them astray. The reason was, because the Jews did or might know better. The Law was read and expounded to them every sabbath, and they were bound to understand and obey it, and were therefore without excuse. And it would seem from Pharaoh's case, that the Law of Nature so clearly reveals this sin, that God holds even the heathen accountable for it. It is so great a sin, that He will not 'wink at' its commission, by any body. It might as well be pretended, that murder *can be* a sin of ignorance among christian people, as that slavery can; for murder is not a plainer crime against the Law of God, than slavery is. All christians have known this solemn fact, or *might* have known it by examination; and if they have ever practised slavery without a knowledge of its criminal nature, they have committed the sin of *wilful* ignorance, which God never did nor ever will 'wink at' or pardon, without genuine repentance and reformation, vide Numb. xv 30, Deut. xvii 13, 2d Chron. xxxvi 15, 16, 17, Ps. xix 13, Prov. i 24—31, xxix 1, Luke xii 47, John iii 19, Heb. vi 4, 5, 6, x 26, 27, 2d Pet. ii 20 21, and numerous other passages. The ignorant heathen who had nothing but the light of nature to guide them, and who fell into many errors on that account, doubtless had many of their sins 'winked at' if not pardoned. But to imagine that christians living under an enlightened dispensation, and surrounded with the full blaze of gospel light, could ever be otherwise than wilfully ignorant of the true nature of slavery, is itself a sin of ignorance altogether inexcusable.

Lecture Second.

ABOLITION.

HAVING thus proven, that slavery is one of the greatest of crimes or sins, I next proceed in a separate Lecture, to prove, *that its immediate and unconditional Abolition*, will be perfectly safe, and greatly beneficial, to all persons and parties concerned or interested therein, and will, therefore, be highly politic, as well as just, righteous and necessary; and that it is the only safe kind of abolition; gradual abolition being very difficult, unsafe and dangerous, and therefore sinful as well as inexpedient. The truth of these great doctrines will most clearly appear in the replies to the various *Objections* urged against abolition. But before proceeding to the main subject of the Lecture, I have *two* special remarks to introduce, of a general nature.

First.—It is contended by many, that though the abolition *principles* are true and right, yet they will not answer in *practice*. Many specious pretences are set up to justify this heresy, which we shall consider hereafter. But I will remark here, that all our other knowledge and experience proves, that this proposition is false. For there is not another case in the world, which is true in theory and false in practice. Not another instance can be found, in physics or metaphysics, or in the whole circle of the arts and sciences, where a theory is *true*, but the practice after that theory is false and dangerous. Universal experience proves, that there is nothing abstractly right, but what is practically right. The reason is, that truth is always consistent with itself, and never inconsistent or contradictory. Nor is there any such thing as an abstract truth or falsehood, without their practical application. Slavery is not an abstraction, any more than murder and other crimes are. Nor is abolition an abstraction. They are both solemn practical realities. Both slaves and slaveholders feel and know them to be such. *Analogy* therefore proves, that if abolition principles be true, the practice after them must be perfectly safe, beneficial and useful. Accordingly, all experience has demonstrated, that the best policy in all cases is, to do immediate and unconditional justice, regardless of consequences; that full and immediate justice is always the highest expediency; and that expediency regardless of right and justice, is always the worst policy. Thus does the Law of Nature require the immediate abolition of slavery. No bad effects ever followed immediate and total abolition, but the worst ones have always followed attempts at gradualism; as the operation of the British apprenticeship act, and more especially of its inevitable abuses, proves. The greatest *prudence* is, always to work righteousness. The Bible also teaches these doctrines plainly; but most of the churches seem not to heed them. The doctrine is strictly true, in regard to the relinquishment of all bad habits and practises. Instant cessation from habitual intemperance, is always found perfectly safe; and such relinquishment is highly recommended by the most intelligent physicians. On the other hand nothing can be found false and erroneous in theory, but what is dangerous and destructive in practice. We have seen in the

First Lecture how false and criminal slavery is. Analogy therefore as well as experience proves, that the practice of it must be highly dangerous and destructive. And that it is so in all respects, no additional arguments are necessary to establish.

The Second general remark is, that the Scriptures plainly and abundantly teach the doctrine of *immediate* repentance and reformation from every sin, without regard to consequences. No doctrine is more fully and plainly taught in the Bible than this; vide Jer. ii 22, iv 1, Dan. iv 27, Matt. iii 2, Mark i 15, Luke xiii 3, xxiv 47, Acts ii 38, iii 19, viii 22, xvii 30, 2d Cor. vi 2, Rev. ii 5, 16 and a multitude of other passages. Thus do the Law of Revelation and the Law of Nature exactly harmonize. There is no such thing as *gradual* repentance and reformation taught in any part of the Bible. The doctrine of worldly, prudential expediency is not found there. The spirit, if not the letter, of every command of repentance is, to repent and reform instantly, forthwith, at all events. Nor is there any such thing as repentance commanded without reformation. Such is generally the letter, and always the spirit, of every penitential command. The clergy always enforce this doctrine in other cases, and urge the awful dangers of delay. Yet great numbers of them insist, that repentance and reformation from the particular sin of slavery must be gradual; because if immediate they would not be safe. Repentance like faith is dead, without works to prove its genuineness. If slavery be wrong, therefore, its immediate abolition must necessarily be right. Those who preach gradual abolition, affect to be wiser than their Maker! God commands immediate, unconditional, complete emancipation. The 58th chapter of Isaiah and the plain spirit of every part of the Scriptures, go the whole length of this doctrine, without any exception or condition. Yet the gradualists say they dare not obey this command, because it is not *safe!* Thus do they charge God with folly; vide Job iv 17–21, 1st Cor. ii 14, iii 19, 20, and other similar passages. Abolition is the doctrine of immediate repentance and reformation from the sin of slavery. It is therefore as plain a doctrine of the Bible, as the New Birth, the Atonement, the Resurrection, or any other doctrine of Christianity; vide Isa. lviii 1, &c. Jer. xxi 12, xxii 3, Eze. iii 17–21, and numerous other passages. And it would seem to be as important a doctrine as any. For none is more repeatedly and strongly inculcated in the Bible; as a comparison of the numerous quotations in the First Lecture, with those which teach the other christian doctrines will prove. The practice of *righteousness* is inculcated all over the Bible. It is difficult to discover how any body *can believe*, that the Bible sanctions slavery. If it be said that the Bible has been thus construed by learned divines, the reply is, that it has been *construed* to justify murder and many other crimes; and it is easy to construe it to justify any crime, and to pervert it by construction to any extent. But if the 'blind will follow the blind,' they must *both* 'fall into the ditch' of error and crime, and both suffer punishment therefor. Neither are excusable for sins of perversion or false construction. Perversions by others are no justification to us, as the Jews found by experience. Love to our neighbor is frequently taught in the same connexion with love to God; vide Deut. x 12, 19, Matt. xxii 37–39, Luke x 27, John xiii 34, xv 12, 1st John iii 17, iv 12, 20, 21; and from the frequency with which it is taught, seems to be next to that great command in importance. Abolition is as we have seen, often expressly taught in the Scriptures. But these *circumstances* show, that it is a christian doctrine of the first importance. The nature and power of the doctrine show the same fact. A doctrine that operates to disenthral millions, and raise them as it were from the grave of slavery; to deliver all mankind both from temporal and spiritual bondage, and impart to all the 'key of knowledge' and the 'word of life,' must necessarily be one of the greatest and most important doctrines of the Christian Religion. I have been extremely anxious to make this point clear; because many christians seem to believe, that though the abolition of slavery is a christian doctrine, it is yet one of *minor importance;* which is a great error.

It seems hardly necessary to add, that Slavery and its Abolition being moral and political opposites, cannot *both* be right or both wrong. If one be right, the other must of course be wrong. Those therefore who profess to oppose both, *cannot fail to err.* If slavery be wrong, its immediate abolition *must be* right. It might as well be pretended, that sin and holiness, justice and injustice, truth and falsehood, virtue and vice, righteousness and unrighteousness, or any other case of moral opposites, are all wrong, as that slavery and abolition both are. In

every case of moral opposites that can be imagined, it is a plain doctrine of the Scriptures, clearly shown by numerous quotations in these Lectures, that one is right and the other is wrong. No Scripture doctrine is plainer than this. It is also a plain doctrine of the Law of Nature, as every person's conscience assures him; and the truth of it is confirmed by every person's experience. Those therefore that oppose slavery and abolition both, cannot fail to sin greatly. And so of the pretence, that slavery is the *handmaid* of liberty, and tends to *strengthen* our republican institutions; to be believed when it is proved, that vice is the 'handmaid' of virtue, sin of holiness, injustice of justice, lewdness of chastity, &c.; and that the operation of all moral opposites, tend to 'strengthen' each others influence!

I will now commence the main subject. And here I readily and heartily acknowledge, that *if* abolition as some falsely pretend, be as bad or worse than slavery, the latter ought to be continued and preserved. Whenever we are compelled to choose between two evils, we ought always to choose the least.

Had the proper christian means to prevent slavery, been freely used at the commencement of the practice in this country, by preaching up the WHOLE gospel in its purity, without any perversion, it would never have gained a footing here. And were this kind of preaching to be commenced in all parts of the country NOW, it would quickly put an end to the abomination; so amazingly powerful is gospel truth, when thoroughly applied to the hearts and consciences of men; vide Isa. xlix 2, Jer. xxiii 29, 2d Cor. x 4, 5, Eph. vi 17, Heb. iv 12, and other passages. The criminal neglect of the clergy, to preach and enforce the *whole* word of God in its purity, and their criminal connivance at and support of slavery. are the principal causes of the continuance and growth of this abomination among us. The clergy of this country, have more reason to fear the wrath of God to follow this curse, than any other persons in it; vide Lev. x 11, 1st Sam. ii 12–17, 2d Chron xix 8–10, Jer. xxiii 9–32, Eze. iii 18, 19, Mic. iii 5, Mal. ii 1–8, Acts xx 20, 26, 27' Gal. ii 11, 1st Tim. v 20, 21, Tit. i 13, and various other passages.

It is remarkable, that the holy prophets were sent, to preach against national, customary, legal, popular sins, and apparently against no other; yet the greater part of the modern clergy have seldom imitated this example, although it was expressly set for their imitation, as a plain rule of official duty. They have seldom preached against such sins, though it was their special duty to do so. Like the false prophets, they have usually connived at popular sins, in all parts of the country. They have generally courted popularity, to the entire neglect of plain duty. Very seldom has any modern preacher, preached directly and faithfully against any popular vice. It is a smiling not a 'frowning world' most of our preachers have sought to face. As soon as a vice becomes unpopular, by other agencies than their own, they could then preach against it; but not before. So our Saviour and his apostles, seldom preached against any *but* popular sins. But their example in this respect, has been entirely disregarded by most modern preachers They have been too fearful of losing popularity, to risk the bold discharge of plain christian duty. Most of them have like Jonah, when he was sent to reprove and warn the Ninevites for their Oppressions and other sins, shrunk from the discharge of their duty; vide Jon. i 2, Nah. iii 1; and they will like him, be punished for this criminal neglect.

The Roman Catholics first commenced the practice of christian slavery, in imitation of the barbarians of western Africa; relying for the reconciliation or rather the hardening of their consciences to it, on the *perversion* of certain texts of Scripture, extracted chiefly from the Levitical Law and the life of Abraham, as stated in the former Lecture, to the entire neglect of the whole spirit, genius and effect of the Scriptures. The custom being thus established, the protestants adopted it on the credit of the same criminal perversions. The Catholics, especially the Jesuits, have perverted a large portion of the Scriptures, to accommodate the base passions and wicked interests of the world; and their perversions have been copied and adopted by so many protestants, that genuine christianity is much obscured, and but little practised in it's purity. We have good reason to believe, that were the Saviour to come again in the flesh at the present time, he would pronounce his church as much corrupted NOW, as it was at his first advent. As christian slavery grew out of christian corruption, so it has contributed

vastly to augment that corruption. And as the practice [illegible] professors, or was early tolerated and licensed by them; so its abolition must [illegible] with them. The fountain whence the poisonous stream has flowed, must be [illegible]. As soon as the churches are cleared of the abomination, the world will abandon it; at least all that part of the world under the influence of genuine christianity will abandon it; vide Prov. [illegible], Matt. [illegible] 13-16, Phil. ii 15, 1st Pet. ii 12. But so long as christians persevere in the practice, under the sanction of the christian church, it will continue to flourish, even in the [illegible] of the country. Let the church sanction a criminal practice, and the world will [illegible] it; let the church renounce it, and the world will renounce it also.

The christian church is set for a 'light' or example to the world; vide Prov. [illegible], Matt. [illegible] 14, Eph. v 8, Phil. ii 15. And if this example be bad, it is the most pernicious the world can have; vide Isa. iii 12, ix 16, Mal. ii 8, Matt. xv 14, Luke vi 39. And such example in the church is sure to meet with punishment; vide Mal. ii 2, Matt. xxi 41, 43, Rev. ii 5, and many other passages. The church is frequently threatened in the Bible, for this very sin; a most ominous warning to the American churches. They have gone on corrupting the country by their slaveholding example. And nothing but this most nefarious example could have enabled American slavery, to attain its present hideous growth and maturity. This growth and maturity cannot be accounted for in any other way.

The principal means to be used for the extinction of slavery are, the PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL. It has been fashionable among the clergy of all denominations, to inculcate the doctrine of preaching the *whole* gospel; and they have been in the habit of giving this doctrine in charge to each other. But strange as it may seem, they have habitually neglected the doctrine in practice; vide Isa. lvi 10-12. In no part of the United States has it ever been customary, to preach against slavery and slavish oppression; though slavery has been the greatest national sin of the country. Nor has the necessity and Divine obligation of its abolition, ever until lately been discussed in the pulpit. They have both been considered forbidden topics, in compliance with wicked custom. Nor has it ever been customary to pray for slaves; vide 1st Tim. ii 1. So much has the spirit of christianity succombed to iniquity in this country! The abolition of slavery, like the abolition of murder and other crimes, is one of the plainest doctrines in the Scriptures; and judging from their spirit, it is one of the most important. And yet, the clergy of all denominations have neglected to preach it! They could preach against murder and most other sins, but not against slavery. The reason was, that slavery has been a fashionable, popular sin, and murder has not; at least not by that name. Had murder been as customary as slavery has been, the clergy would probably never have preached against it. They will in general preach none but popular doctrines, for fear of losing the favor of the *world!* vide John vii 7, xv 18, 19, xvii 16, Rom. xii 2, 1st John ii 15-17, iii 10, 13.

Religious preachers and teachers have much more moral and immoral influence in the world than others, and whenever they neglect to denounce any immorality, it is understood to receive their silent sanction, and flourishes greatly. And much more rapidly yet will it grow, if they openly advocate and practice it, as thousands of them have slavery. The priesthood of every country hold the keys of its morality. Nothing contributes so much to the growth of any sinful abomination, as to have the *church* adopt it; vide Isa. v 20-24. It justifies the sin in the eyes of the world, and renders the practice of it a virtue. This criminal conduct of the American church, is the principal cause of the rapid growth of American slavery.

In this country the pulpit, like the bench, the bar, the press, and the other governing influences of society, have ever observed a most criminal silence on the subject of slavery. The doctrine of 'taking up the cross' has been inculcated in words, it is true. But most of those who preach it manifest by their habitual conduct, that they are among the last persons in the world who intend to practice it. The popular applause of the world and the honors and emoluments it bestows, have so much engrossed the affections of the clergy, that very few of them have had the boldness and honesty to preach against popular sins. And the corrupt customs of the country have thriven accordingly. The criminal silence of the clergy and their criminal acquiescence in the sin of slavery, have been a great 'stumbling block and rock of offence' to the progress of christianity, and have contributed largely to the spread of infidelity. Many

have been disgusted with their efforts to support slavery from the bible, and have been induced to discredit the whole christian system for that reason. Christian perversions of Bible truth have probably made more infidels, than any other cause.

The reason why I am thus severe on the clergy is, that it is their *peculiar* duty to preach the whole gospel; the special duty of their peculiar calling. All men owe the general duty, of acknowledging and obeying the whole gospel; but it is the special duty of the clergy to proclaim and enforce it, to vindicate all its precepts, and to protest against all its perversions and abuses. See the solemnity and extent of their charge in 2d Tim. iv 1–5, and other passages. It is also their duty to preach against particular sins, *according to their enormity and degree of prevalence*; as their predecessors the prophets and apostles did, and as all great evangelical reformers have since done, vide Ex. v 1, 2d Sam. xii 7, Ezra ix 6, Eze. xxxix 7–9, Dan. ix 3–19, Jon. i 2, iii 3, 4, Acts vii 51, 52, xx 20, 26, 27, 2d Tim. ii 14, James v 1, and numerous other cases. No case of special duty can be plainer than this. But these special duties they have to a great extent neglected. They have in many important cases, sought to conform the gospel to the world, and not the world to the gospel; to the great disgrace of their calling, and the destruction of human rights and happiness. I am aware there have been some noble exceptions to this sweeping censure. It is to be hoped, that the number of such exceptions will increase.

Many professing christians act as if they were afraid, that the agitation of the abolition question would produce discord among christian brethren, and so divide and injure the churches; just as if the preaching of true christianity could *injure* it! A preacher who seemed to fear this result in his own sect, told me, that another preacher of the same sect whom he named, and who was a zealous abolitionist, had hurt his *usefulness* very much, by the course he had pursued in the abolition cause. I asked this preacher, if he supposed our Saviour considered how much he hurt *his* usefulness, by the course he pursued in reproving and denouncing the Scribes and Pharisees? Or if the apostles weighed *their* loss of influence, by denouncing idol worship and other heathen abominations? Or if Luther, Calvin, Knox and the other christian reformers, thought of the mischief *they* were producing, by rending the catholic church in twain; and thus producing 'discord among brethren;' and how much they lessened their own 'influence and usefulness' by so doing? These questions seemed to confound the preacher a good deal, and he made little or no reply. Some time after this, another preacher told me, that he thought a better course might be pursued than that taken by the abolitionists; and that preaching the gospel only would finally destroy slavery. I answered him in substance, that if the clergy *would* preach the gospel, and the whole gospel, they would indeed soon destroy slavery. But as they *now* preach, they rather increased than diminished the curse. The preacher made no reply.

From the foregoing premises it is clear, that the American church has been guilty of the most scandalous and detestable *hypocrisy*. And it being committed in so plain a case and gross a manner, proves the deep corruption of that church. If we judge from the letter and spirit of the scriptures, there is hardly a more flagitious sin than *Hypocrisy*, especially when committed in religious and moral matters; vide Job viii 13, xv 34, xx 5, xxviii 8, xxxvi 13, Prov. xxx 12—14, Isa. ix 17, x 6, xxxii 6, xxxiii 14, lxvi 3, Matt. v 19, 20, vi 2, 5, 16, vii 3—5, 21—23, xii 34, xv 6, 9, xxiii 3 13—23, Mark vii 9, Luke vi 42, xi 44—52, xii 1, xiii 15, John xii 42, 43, Rom. ii 17—21, 2 Thess. ii 10, 1 Tim. iv 2, Tit. i 16, Rev. ii 9, iii 9, and numerous other passages of the same import. Hypocrisy is the profession of virtue united with the practice of its opposite vice, as the numerous quotations prove. And the scandalous prevalence of it in the American church, is the principal cause of the universal prevalence of it in the nation. In no nation that ever existed, has moral and political hypocrisy abounded as it has in this union. The constant *profession* of liberty, democracy and equal rights has gone on, hand in hand with the *practice* of the most barbarous and cruel slavery, for more than one hundred and fifty years!

Nothing is to be gained but much lost, by *mild*, conciliatory preaching, against the atrocious sin of slavery. It only produces contempt for the preacher and the cause he advocates.—Hence all those prudent writers and orators, who have pursued what is called a *middle* or moderate course, in the present struggle against slavery, carefully avoiding the violent de-

nunciations of the imprudent abolitionists, meet with so favorable a reception. It is a mortal offence in them, that they have meddled with the subject of slavery at all. The slaveholders fear and of course hate the abolitionists, but scorn all temporizers, because they are sensible the subject does not properly admit of such conduct. They respect the abolitionists for their honesty and independence, but heartily despise all temporizers. Implicit obedience or open war, is the only alternative with tyrants of every description; and whoever expects to win their favor and command their respect, will never fail to refuse all concessions or compromise with their tyranny.

The truth is, none but the abolitionists do or will preach the Gospel doctrines in relation to slavish oppression, plain and important as those doctrines are. And it is also true, that the quicker a corrupt church is divided and rent asunder, the better. When any church becomes so corrupt, as to sanction wicked practices by custom, it ought to be destroyed for the general good. The Jewish church was destroyed for this very reason. One object of Christ's mission was to destroy this church, on account of its crimes, and to substitute a pure church in its stead. The rending of the Catholic church in twain by the Reformation, was necessary to purge the christian church of its manifold corruptions. And the same church now needs purifying from its slave corruptions. And so far from the influence of the abolitionists being lessened by the measures they have pursued, we must believe from the effects produced by their doctrines, in all parts of this corrupt country, that it is great indeed. The ministry of the apostles did not give greater offence to moral corruption, than theirs now does.—And it is at the present time specially desirable, that their moral influence should be thus powerful. For the country is so corrupted by slavery, that but for this influence, its liberties would not probably survive the present anti-slavery struggle. In a peculiar manner ought the present abolitionists, to be denoted the 'salt of the earth' in this country; their influence and labors being the only true bulwark of its remaining liberties. Nothing but those can, under God, abolish the corruption of the country, and purify it of its tyranny. These corruptions are enormous, and dare Heaven to inflict vengeance on the country. The majority of preachers and a multitude of church professors in the slave states, are reported to be slaveholders; and the church morality in those states corresponds with the horrid fact. It is my opinion, that most of the American sects are as corrupt at the present time, as the Roman Catholic church was in Luther's time. Against this tide of moral and political profligacy, the abolitionists have yet to contend successfully and effectually, if the liberties of the country are to be preserved.

I wish it here to be understood, that I make no *sectarian* application of the severe censures I have passed on our church and clergy. The Friends, Covenanters and Seceders and portions of some of the other sects, have partially washed their hands of the sin of slavery. But the melancholy truth is, the morality of all our churches on the subject of human oppression, is as Mr. Crothers truly observes, 'rotten to the core.'

Nor is slavery the only sin that has corrupted our church morality. It is dreadfully corrupted by the sin of *licentiousness*, and some others. But as these causes of corruption do not come specially within the scope of the Lecture, I omit their consideration.

I have stated the *principal* means for the extinction of slavery to be, the preaching of the Gospel doctrine in relation to this sin. It should also be stated, that this doctrine is always to be preached, in connexion with that of Abolition. As the Scriptures have classed them together, so they are always to be preached together. And there is at least one good reason, to which no one can make any honest objection, why all persons ought to give earnest heed to this preaching. And this is, that it is of *immediate importance*. All other sorts of objections have been raised against the doctrines taught by the abolitionists, except that of its small importance, which never has and never will be seriously pretended. All abolitionists, anti-abolitionists, slaves, slaveholders and their advocates are agreed, that these doctrines are of the highest importance to every body. The conduct of all classes of our inhabitants, proves that they thus believe. The vilest mobites and Lynch men admit the fact by their conduct. They never would be at such criminal pains and expense, nor run such criminal risks, unless they fully believed in the reality of this fact. Such being the universally admitted fact, pro-

ple ought to study and understand the abolition doctrines thoroughly, for we ought to study every thing thoroughly, in proportion to its importance to us; and these doctrines are of the highest personal importance, to every man, woman and child in the country. And this interest is now so intense, that if they are true, they ought to be immediately adopted and acted upon; if false, they ought to be immediately refuted and rejected.

Most opposers of the project of immediate emancipation, seem to argue as if they supposed, that slavery presents some *natural* and invincible obstacle, to its own abolition. But this is no more true, than that counterfeiting, forgery and other acknowledged crimes present such an obstacle. We have already proved, that slavery is not a natural evil in any sense, any more than murder, robbery, forgery, perjury and other acknowledged crimes are. It is an *artificial*, voluntary, factitious evil, crime or sin; and as such can be abolished, by the same means that all other crimes are, namely, by Law. All that is necessary for the purpose is, the passage of the proper Law by the rightful legislative power, and obedience to it afterwards, the same as to laws against other crimes. And this Law may be very short; like the statutes against most other crimes. There is no difficulty in preparing a statute, completely adequate to the purpose. The British abolition act does not occupy much over a square, of common newspaper print. This sufficed to put an immediate and total stop to the practice of slavery, in Antigua and Bermuda; and is sufficient to abolish the practice in any place where slavery prevails, *when the subjects of the law are willing to obey it.* And when they become thus willing, there is no doubt but they will be equally willing to pass such laws when necessary.—The only obstacles to the passage of such laws, are not of a natural but moral kind. The great object then at which the present abolitionists should aim, is therefore plain. They should endeavour *to abolitionize the whole country*, slaveholders and all. When this effect is produced, when the whole country *wish* to abolish slavery, it will be found as easy and practicable to do so, as to abolish murder or any other crime; and by the use of the same means, namely, Law. Whenever a people wish to abolish a criminal practice, they have only to will such abolition, in the form of law.

In the case of the white people of this country, all slavish violence and oppression, is now in effect, abolished by Law. It is true, this is not *by name*. But the Laws provided against assault and battery, false imprisonment, mayhem, murder &c. produce the same effect, as a law expressly provided against slavery. If the least attempt is made to enslave a white person of any description, he or she can apply to the Law for redress, and have full and ample relief by due course of Law. They can have all the counsel and assistance necessary for this purpose. What abolitionists demand as naked justice is, that the benefit and protection of these just laws, be extended to all human beings alike, to the coloured as well as the white, the bond as well as the free man; and that all mankind be allowed the same legal rights and protection, without regard to colour or other physical peculiarities, as God originally gave them. The Almighty they say, has given the same equal rights to all men alike, and it is blasphemous for one portion of the human race, to deprive another of them, without crime in the portion deprived. God has made but one law or rule of conduct for man; the latter has no right therefore, to make different laws for different men. God's law is without respect to colour or other physical peculiarities; man's laws ought not therefore to respect them. Man ought never to affect to be wiser than his Maker. It is in the highest degree blasphemous for him to do so.

The only real obstacle to the immediate abolition of slavery in the United States, is the want of a willing mind, a righteous disposition in the slaveholders, who alone have the legal right, to pass laws for that purpose. As soon as they possess this disposition, as soon as they *will* the destruction of slavery, it will be abolished with the slightest possible inconvenience, loss, trouble or danger. Nothing can be easier or safer than the immediate abolition of slavery, when the public mind is prepared for such abolition. There is not the slightest difficulty in the nature of the measure *itself*; as the numerous trials of it, among other evidence, have abundantly proven. The only obstacles at the present time, are not of a natural but a moral kind. Remove these by the spirit of righteousness, and slavery falls at once, without any loss, trouble or danger. It is not however to be expected, that all the slavehol-

ders of the present generation, will be converted to the entire truth on this question. Many of them it is to be presumed, are too corrupt for such conversion, vide Eph. iv 19, 1 Tim. iv 2 But if a large majority of them can be set right, the holy work can be accomplished.

But some argue, that most of the slaveholders are so corrupt, they never will or can, become convinced of the sin of slavery, nor converted to its abandonment. Let us consider the nature and extent of this supposed invincible wickedness; for the abolitionists have never slandered the slaveholders thus. They have never considered them as bad as the devil; as it would seem these faint hearted reasoners do. They have uniformly asserted, that the great majority of the slaveholders can become thus convinced; and that were it not for the unprincipled efforts of their northern apologists and abetters, they soon would be convinced. And the truth we may reasonably conclude is, that they will in a few years, become thoroughly convinced and converted. Erroneous prejudices however strong, corrupt customs however inveterate, can with the blessing of God, be overcome by the power of the truth; as all religious and moral reforms will testify. The corrupt prejudices of the people of Great Britain engendered by slavery, were overcome by these means; and to pretend that unjust prejudices of any kind, are less vincible in this enlightened country, than in that, is slanderous and absurd. We have no more good reason to suppose, that the labors of the present abolitionists of this country will be in vain, than that those of Sharpe, Clarkson, Wilberforce and their associates, would have been forty years ago. Nay, so rapid and powerful is the march of truth here, that we have every good reason to believe, that American Slavery will be essentially abolished, in the next ten years.

Let us examine this probability. When the British abolitionists commenced their great work, the experiment of emancipation was new and untried. All the usual bugbears were conjured up against it, and seemed like realities. The government which alone possessed the legal power to abolish, was essentially aristocratic and proportionally corrupt. Two branches of it were hereditary, and all three at first, bitterly opposed to the project, as were almost all the people, and were also supposed to be deeply interested in the support of slavery. The project was itself in its infancy; and the best modes of effecting it were imperfectly known, and needed the fostering hand of time to mature them. The first projectors experienced all the opposition, persecution, reproach, ridicule and other difficulties, that great innovators have uniformly experienced. And yet the truth and righteousness, agreeably to the promises of God, at last prevailed.

On the other hand, the American Abolitionists possess the great advantage, afforded by the proofs of the complete success, of the numerous experiments of immediate emancipation, already made on the great scale. All the bug bears raised against abolition have been dissipated by facts, to the perfect satisfaction of every well informed person. Our government is wholly elective and republican in form. It is contaminated by a base slave aristocracy to be sure. But this aristocracy is not hereditary; and depending for its legislative support wholly on the elective franchise, can and will in the end be overthrown, unless it yield to the influence of abolition principles. Besides, the progress of those principles is much more rapid now, than it was forty years ago. When the free states become thoroughly abolitionized, their moral influence on the slave states will be irresistable; and this crisis is rapidly maturing. At the rate abolition principles have gained ground in the free states during the last five years, it will not take five years more to abolitionize them. As soon as this great effect is produced, the slave states will within five years thereafter, commence the work of abolition themselves. Far less means used now will produce a much greater effect, than the same means would forty or even twenty years ago. When all or a great majority of the free inhabitants of this country have become abolitionists, the great work may be considered as essentially finished. The remainder of it will be a mere trifling matter of form; because all works of righteousness are easy and safe.

For the clearer illustration of this interesting subject, I will divide it into four heads, namely,

1st. The Objects of Abolition;
2d. The Means of Abolition;
3d. The Modes of Abolition; and,
4th. The Effects of Abolition; and

First: the *Objects* of Abolition.

These Objects are, to abolish the laws, customs and practice of slavery, and restore the protection of the common law and all just statute laws to the slaves; thus making them to become freemen with the whites, enjoying the same just. equal rights and privileges. It is to abrogate all unjust, unequal laws and customs whatever, and restore the supremacy of all just and equal laws within the jurisdiction, over all persons alike, without regard to colour or other physical peculiarities. It is to restore the same just rights to all men now unjustly deprived of them, as God originally gave them. It is to procure repentance and reformation from the sin of slavery, by 'letting all the oppressed go free', and consequently, to ensure the blessings of peace, pros-

perity and happiness to the country, that God has promised shall flow from all works of righteousness; and in the end, extend the same happy results and sure blessings to the rest of mankind. These are the great and only objects of the proposed Abolition of Slavery.

Secondly; the *Means* of Abolition; the united effect of which is intended to abolitionize the whole country, and thus procure a *general* and complete abolition. And here I would for the sake of brevity, observe at once, they are, *all just, lawful, peaceable, righteous and christian means whatever,* that are capable of being used for the righteous purpose. This description is so comprehensive, as to embrace all the most powerful moral and religious means known. They are essentially the same means used by our Saviour, and by the holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs, and by all moral reformers and good men since; and which by means of the art of printing and other modern improvements, are rendered more rapid, efficient and powerful in their operation. They are not 'carnal weapons', but 'mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds.' They are metaphorically called in the Scriptures, the 'sword of the spirit': vide Eph. vi 7. They are said to be 'sharper than a two edged sword', (Heb. iv 12,) the most powerful weapon known. By this I mean as the Scriptures represent, all the christian means enjoined in the Bible. They consist simply in the proclamation of the truth, and the application of it to the understandings and consciences of men, to the conviction of their minds. Those simple righteous means, have produced greater moral and religious revolutions in the world, than all other means put together; and this simply, because they are wherever they can be applied, irresistable. And so sensible are the slaveholders and their friends of this fact, that they endeavor by all means even the most criminal, to prevent their use and agency; but in vain.

I have said the *principal* means to be used for the abolition of slavery, were the preaching of the whole Gospel. But in addition to this and auxiliary to it, are several others, viz:

Cleansing the churches; by excommunicating all slaveholding professors, and withdrawing christian fellowship from them. It is a plain Divine command, that where professors practice great sins, and will not after due admonition repent and reform, to excommunicate and withdraw from them,—vide Isa. i 25, Eze. xx 38, Matt. v 30, xviii 8, 15--17, Mark ix 43, 45, 1st Cor. v 1—7, x 20, 2d Cor. vi 14, 2d Thess. iii 14, 15, Eph. v 3—11, 1st Tim. i 20, Tit. ii 12, 14, and many other passages. Purification from sin and avoidance of all contact with it, are the spirit of the whole Scriptures. Church fellowship should be a communion of saints with saints, and not of saints with satan,—vide 1st Cor. x 20, 21, Rev. ii 2, 13—16, 20—23. Unrepenting and unreformed slaveholders, have no more christian right to gospel ordinances, than other atrocious criminals; and to partake of them is no more wicked for the one than the other, (1st Cor. xi 27, 28, 29,); and it is as sinful for innocent persons to partake with slaveholders, as with other criminals; such conduct being a tacit approval of their crimes; vide Ps. l 18—22, 1st Tim. i 9, 10.

Another means are, abstaining from the products of slave labor. Could effectual means be devised, to enable free persons to dispense with these products, it would have a powerful tendency to shorten slavery.

Bearing testimony against slavery, at all convenient times and on all proper occasions; talking, writing, arguing and inveighing against it,—vide Eze. iii 18, 19, ix 29, xvii 17, 2d Tim. iv 2, Tit. ii 15, Jude 3. Constant advocacy of the truth and righteousness, is the spirit of the whole Scriptures.

Public disputes, debates, arguments, sermons, addresses, lectures, &c. against slavery and in favor of its abolition,—vide ante.

Contributing money and means according to ability and opportunity, with the same zeal as for other good works, (vide 1st. Tim. vi 18, Tit. ii 14,) for the following purposes, namely;

To support papers and tracts, on the subjects of Slavery and Abolition;

To support anti-slavery disputants, lecturers, writers and teachers;

To support anti-slavery printing presses and depositories;

To circulate anti-slavery books, tracts and papers, and to recommend their candid and attentive perusal;

To petition congress and the state legislatures, to abolish slavery within their respective jurisdictions;

To organize Anti-Slavery Societies, and promote their active and efficient operation;

To support the American and various State anti-slavery societies; Eccl. xi 1, Isa. xxxii 20, Rom. xv 27, 1st Cor. ix 7, Gal. vi 6.

And here I would inculcate the principal uses of *auxiliary* anti-slavery societies, such as ought to be organized and kept in active operation, in every town and village in the land, where the friends of the cause are able to organize them.

Their principal use is, to form anti-slavery libraries, and procure and circulate, the most useful anti slavery books, papers and tracts. A very small amount of funds, are sufficient for this most effectual purpose. And where these funds are raised from the joint contributions of the members, they impose but a light burthen upon individuals. Each society should procure the best abolition books and papers, for general circulation. Its members should also prepare and circulate, each its own abolition circulars and petitions.

These societies are also useful, for the purpose of raising funds to support the larger societies, their papers, periodicals, lecturers and agents. If well attended to, they are of the greatest utility in this way.

They are useful for the purposes of debate, on the great subjects of Slavery and Abolition.—And here I would observe, it should be a fixed rule with them, to render their debates common to all persons present, whether members or not, especially to opposers; and that such debates should be conducted with the utmost candor and fairness, and in the spirit of friendship and good will towards opposers.

Abolitionists should among other virtues, especially practice that of perseverance; (vide Matt. x 32, 1st Cor. xv 58, Eph. vi 13, and other passages); and in all respects endeavour to imitate, the perfect example of our Saviour, and the blessed though imperfect example, of the prophets, apostles, martyrs and other reformers. Nor ought the 'fear of man' to deter them from the persevering discharge of their righteous duty; vide Ps. xxxvii, Prov. xxix 25, 1st Pet. iii 14. The bold preaching of the truth and righteousness, is always offensive to guilty consciences, and produces great excitement and malice against the preachers; vide Matt. x 31—36. But the Divine commands to preach it, are imperative on all mankind; and wicked opposition is no excuse for the neglect of it. Perseverance in well doing has always produced wonderful changes; and with the blessing of God, produce the same effects on slavery. The use of all the above mentioned means should be persevered in, until every person in the country arrived to years of discretion, shall have become a thorough abolitionist. The great enterprise will then be completely accomplished.

The object to be attained by the use of all these various Means, is to *turn the current* of public opinion against slavery. Change that sentiment, purify it of its present corruptions, set it right with respect to the abomination, and it will soon put an end to slavery in all parts of the country — When in consequence of this virtuous change in the free states, the slaveholders shall find themselves when out of the slave states, frowned upon by an indignant community, and like other criminals excluded from respectable society, they will be compelled to serious reflection, the result of which will be, repentance from the sin of slavery. When they find no rest from an accusing conscience, nor peace of mind, they will repent and reform. It is currently reported and believed, that our manners and institutions have a powerful tendency, to revolutionize those of the European countries, and that the republican sentiment of this country has inspired a similar sympathy, in the subjects of those countries. Has the sentiment and morals of the free states less influence on the slave states, than those of the two united have upon Europe? Nay verily, they are vastly greater.

And there is the greatest encouragement for the present abolitionists, to labor industriously in their holy cause. The moral energies of the whole world are evidently rousing against slavery. Most of the European governments are taking sides against it; and the power of anti-slavery truth was never felt so strongly, as at the present time. But few acts of emancipation have as yet taken place in this country. But the progress of the cause in other countries shows, what it must finally become here. Millions of slaves have been liberated on anti-slavery principles, in South America, the West Indies and elsewhere. The few instances that have occurred in this country, are as the slight appearances of water in the shaft of a well, before the spring is reached. When a general emancipation does take place in this country, it will be done suddenly; as in most other cases of emancipations.

And there are certain signs observable, which usually precede such a result. The demand for anti-slavery books, tracts and papers is greatly increased. The public jealousy and antipathy to the abolition scheme, has greatly abated in the free states, and is perceptibly less in some parts of the slave states, and will wholly subside, when the merits of the scheme are well understood. A general spirit of inquiry on the subject has been kindled. But perhaps the behaviour of the slaveholders is the surest indication. Aware of the dangers to which their darling institution is exposed, their rage excited to deadly ferocity, has trampled the constitution of the country under foot, to support it; but in vain. The very means they have used to suppress inquiry and stifle the abolition cause, have promoted both greatly. But as they have despaired of success, their fury has somewhat abated, and they are beginning to reason and reflect. As soon as they have settled into cool reflection, as they inevitably soon must, they will begin to repent and reform from the sinful course they have so long pursued.

Thirdly; the *Modes* of abolishing Slavery.

Abolition by force of arms, has never entered into the views of modern abolitionists. They will never adopt it under any circumstances. There are two other modes by far more effectual, both of which are perfectly just, righteous, safe and easy, one of which is *direct* and the other *indirect.* The first or direct mode, is the abolition of slavery by positive statute law, as in the cases of the laws against murder and most other crimes. The other or indirect mode, is simply ceasing to commit the crime of slavery, by a voluntary release of the slaves, without any legislative action or enactment. Either of these modes is sufficient for the purpose, *when the public mind is prepared to adopt them.* The first is however the most effectual, and wherever it is practicable should be preferred. To understand how simple, easy and effectual it is, *when the public*

are willing to obey the law, we have only to reflect on the case, with which other crimes and immoral practises are abolished by law. Whenever it is desired by a community, to put a stop to the practises of gambling, horse racing, lotteries, sabbath breaking, profane swearing or other offences against good morals; or to abolish the higher crimes of murder, rape, robbery, arson, forgery, counterfeiting &c., every body understands that it is perfectly practicable and easy, to abolish these crimes and offences, by passing and enforcing short, comprehensive statute laws, rendering them penal in proportion to their criminality. Now it is just as easy to abolish slavery by the same means, *when the public are ready and willing, to pass and enforce the laws made for the purpose;* or in other words, when the whole community have become abolitionists. We also know it would be of no avail, to enact laws against crimes of any description, unless the subjects of the laws were willing, to respect and obey them when made. If a law against murder for instance, could not be obeyed, it would be a dead letter, and it would be useless to enact it. And if the people of this country had been as long in the habit, of committing the crime of murder as they have that of slavery, there would be the same need of abolition efforts to abolish murder, that there now is to abolish slavery. And so for the abolition of every other crime established by law or custom; as almost every crime at different times and places has been, and yet is in heathen countries. Slavery is as great a crime against the Law of God, and ought to be against the laws of men, as murder or any other crime. And it ought to be abolished by laws as penal and severe, as those against murder are.

It is probable that the indirect mode will, to a considerable extent, first prevail in this country. The *legal* right or right to abolish it by law, belongs only to the slaveholders themselves. They have the same right and are under the same moral obligation, to abolish slavery, that they are to abolish murder; and for the same reason; because it is *a crime*. As they become gradually abolitionized, their prejudices against slavery and in favor of its abolition, will be proportionally increased. They will commence by degrees; at first in solitary cases, and afterwards in larger numbers, *before* the passage of any general law or act of abolition. And though many of these private manumissions be contrary to law, yet if most of the slaveholders become friendly to the practice, hardly any body will be found mean and wicked enough, to put the infamous statutes against emancipation in force; and thus the practice of voluntary emancipation will become safe, and ultimately fashionable and popular. It is of great importance therefore, that the country become abolitionized as fast and as soon as possible, in order that those slaveholders who are disposed to practice righteousness, may be safe in so doing. As soon as the whole country becomes generally abolitionized, Lynch law, alias mob outrage and murder, will cease, and all the laws and customs of slavery, and those opposed to its abolition, become a dead letter. According to recent accounts we have good reason to believe, that were private manumission safe, great numbers of slaves would be liberated immediately. This is the consequence of preaching that part of the gospel, that declares slavery to be among the greatest of crimes against the Law of God.

The reason why so many people cannot see *how* slavery can be abolished, is for the want of reflecting how other crimes are abolished or abandoned. Yet I have heard people make this pretence, who well knew how other crimes were suppressed. But there is not a jot of difference in the cases. Some pretend it will be of no avail to enact laws to abolish slavery, because the slaveholders will not submit to them. To this the reply is, that as none but the slaveholders have a *right* to make such laws, no apprehensions need be entertained of their being made, before entire obedience to them is insured; that is, until all the slaveholders or a great majority of them, become real abolitionists. Moral reformations always precede political; as they will in this case. The only real difficulty is not in the modes of abolition themselves, but in a righteous disposition to adopt and enforce them.

In connexion with the law abolishing slavery, a short declaratory act should be passed, declaring the Common Law and all just and equal statute laws, to be in force over all persons within the jurisdiction, without any distinction. There is not the slightest real difficulty in the nature of abolition itself, as many ignorant persons seem to suppose. The only real obstacle is the perverse and wicked wills, of those who have the power to practice it. If all the slaveholders had the same inclination, they have the power and facilities to abolish, slavery would not last a week in any part of the slave states.

It will not fail to be obvious to every reflecting mind, that were the whole country to become thoroughly abolitionized, as it eventually will be, the indirect mode of abolition could and would be universally practised. Were every slaveholder now a genuine abolitionist, as he ought to be, he would instantly call his slaves together, as he ought without delay, tell them he had wrongfully held them in bondage, ask God's pardon and theirs, for the great sins he had committed in so doing, and declare them unconditionally free. Nay, he would go farther. He would offer to make them all the reparation in his power, for the injuries he had inflicted on them. He would thenceforth give them what is 'just and equal'; fair wages and constant employment.—He would furnish them with the means of literary, moral and religious instruction; and thenceforth be to them a benefactor, as he had before been their oppressor. A slaveholder thoroughly imbued with the spirit of righteousness, would not wait for the authority of statute laws, to

authorise him to practice that great virtue, when it was safe for him to do so. In such case there would in reality be no absolute necessity, for new statutory provisions of any kind. All the atrocious laws made for the support of slavery, or the prevention of its abolition, might be suffered to stand unrepealed on the statute books as a dead letter, and as records of national reproach and shame; there being few to be found base and infamous enough to enforce them. All this will actually take place, as soon as the abolition project becomes decidedly popular.

But the direct mode is in all cases to be preferred, as fast as the slave states are prepared to adopt it, and as the best mode of expressing the national repentance. This mode will cut off all possibility of injury accruing to those, who are willing to practice the righteous work of abolition. There will always be some few miscreants in society, wicked and mean enough, to endeavour to enforce unjust laws. To prevent injury from them, short comprehensive statutes should be enacted, wholly abolishing slavery, by abolishing all slave laws and customs. This method has been adopted in more than one instance, with the most perfect safety, success and advantage; and the adoption of it in this country, *when the slaveholders are prepared for it by being abolitionized*; will be attended with the same happy results. I proceed lastly to consider,

Fourthly, the *Effects* of Abolition.

And here I would observe in general, that all the *evidence* of which the case is susceptible shows, that all the good effects which can result from any act of righteousness, will flow from Immediate Abolition. Those who predict danger, loss, ruin and all manner of evil consequences, to flow from such Abolition, predict directly against all the *evidence* in the case, directly contrary to the precepts of the Law of Revelation and the Law of Nature, directly contrary to the natural course of events, to uniform experience, to the tendency of human nature, to all reasonable probability, to analogy and common sense. The fruits of works of righteousness is always good; vide James iii 18. No injury was ever known to result from such works. Universal suffrage was formerly a great bug-bear; though nothing was more just and good; but its operation has been good so far as it has been tried.

In every case of Immediate Emancipation that has hitherto occurred, instead of producing danger, it has removed all danger, by removing the only cause of it, slavery. Instead of loss and ruin, it has produced great pecuniary profit, to the master as well as the emancipated slave. Instead of idleness and dissipation, pauperism and vagrance, it has produced industry, temperance, steady habits, good morals and competence, by removing the great cause of those evils, human oppression. *Not one* of the evil effects falsely predicted by its enemies, have ever followed immediate emancipation; but on the contrary, *every one* of the good effects predicted by its friends, have so far uniformly followed it; which proves beyond all doubt that they will follow it in this country. Like causes always produce like effects.

The uniform news from the British West Indies countries all these facts. Notwithstanding the wretched temporary apprenticeship in some of the emancipated islands, abolition has already increased their prosperity; while it has doubled that of those who are entirely free, and has removed all danger whatever. Both the white and coloured inhabitants are now comparatively happy. Abolition is generally popular among the white people. Most of them rejoice in the change; nor would any consideration whatever, induce them to return to slavery. Six months experience will produce the same effects in this country. All will be in favor of it when they have experienced its benefits.

The effects of emancipation on the *slaves* will be, to increase their happiness every way.—Deliverance from their present cruel bondage, receipt of fair wages, a comfortable enjoyment for the first time of the ordinary good things of life, participation in the privileges and blessings of education, and the other numerous advantages which rational freedom always confers, will all combine to promote their felicity. The effects on the *slaveholders* will be, deliverance from the fears and dangers inseparable from slavery; increase of the value of their remaining property, far beyond that of the slave property lost, and increase also of annual profits. And they will for the first time, enjoy the peace of enlightened consciences, which they do not now possess. The effects on the *country* will be, a great increase of its financial prosperity, and of the marketable value of its domain, both real and personal; increase of arts, manufactures and public improvements of all kinds; greatly increased strength to the union, by the cessation of civil discord; harmony and friendship in the national councils, deliverance from the foul stigma and reproach that now tarnishes the national character, and consequent increased respectability abroad. The national strength will be vastly increased, by the necessary operation of the measure. It will change 3,000,000 of internal foes into friends; thus increasing the real strength of the country, by the addition of what compared with its present strength, will be equivalent to 6,000,000 good citizens; in the same manner as Great Britain increased her effective strength, by emancipation, by the addition to her wide Empire, of an equivelent to 1,600,000 true and loyal subjects. The effect on the *world* will be, to hasten the general abolition of slavery every where; to introduce better systems of morals and government; to increase the prosperity and happiness of all nations, and extend the knowledge and practice of the true religion of the Gospel. All these and many more beneficial effects will follow, as the consequence of the entire abolition of American slavery.

Many persons express their fears, of some great *disruption* or *convulsion* in society, to follow so great a change, as that of so great a multitude of slaves, from the heaviest bondage to instant freedom. Their fears are however, wholly destitute of rational foundation, as I shall soon prove. Nor will any *special* legislation be necessary, to provide for the emancipated slaves; so admirably qualified are they to provide for themselves, as will be clearly shown. The indulgence of such apprehensions will appear, not only premature but weak and foolish if not blasphemous.

The remainder of the Lecture will be principally devoted, to the examination and refutation, of the most common current *Objections*, employed against immediate emancipation.

If any one thing more than another, could place the despicable character of American hypocrisy in the strongest light, it is the blasphemous sophistical ingenuity exhibited by the majority of its free population, to support American oppression and prevent its abolition. Democrats prating all their lives about 'liberty, equality and equal rights,' and sympathysing strongly with the oppressed of other nations; anti-masons making the country ring, with the story of the outrages on the rights of *one* white person; pious, exemplary professors of religion, canting about the 'bondage of sin, the glorious liberty of the Gospel,' and about the wants of the 'poor heathen' in foreign lands, are to be found in great numbers, striving to render the American name a by-word of reproach, by endeavouring to justify slavery from the Bible, excusing the guilt of its present continuance, and by the most criminal abuse of the friends of emancipation. No hypocrisy has ever yet appeared so despicable, as that of republican, christian America. But on the other hand, there are many honest but ignorant people, who fear emancipation as a worse evil than slavery. It is therefore proper, to give the most important anti-abolition Objections, a somewhat extensive consideration.

1st Obj.—*Colonization.*

As Colonization is the grand remedy, of all those opposers of Abolition, who are willing that slavery should cease, it deserves particular notice.

Notwithstanding the abundant proof that has been circulated, of the wickedness and futility of the colonization scheme, yet many apparently honest people, through ignorance and the want of a thorough examination of its demerits, continue to cleave to it, as the only supposed *possible* means, of ridding the country of slavery. They seem to regard slavery as invincible *here*, in this boasted land of liberty, light and gospel privileges! *Prima facie*, there seems to be something like stupidity in this notion. Of all the countries in the world, this ought according to its own boasted reputation, to be the easiest and readiest, to extirpate slavery and establish liberty in.

The Colonization scheme is founded on this false principle, that the coloured people of the United States, have NO RIGHT to their freedom and equal rights, in this their native land. The Colonization Society has not *said* so in so many words. This would have been direct blasphemy; because the Almighty himself has proclaimed the natural equality of Human Rights, to all human beings alike, every where and at all times and places; vide Gen: i 26—28, Numb. xvi 22, Job xii 10, Isa. xlii 5, Acts xvii 25, 26, and many other passages. God has not made the least distinction, in the moral and political Rights and Duties, of his intelligent creatures. Equality of rights and duties among adults, is the spirit of the whole scriptures; as is plain from the *generality* of almost every command contained in them. These commands are given to all men without distinction; thus plainly implying the doctrine, that the *Rights* necessary to enable men to obey them, are common to all. But the Colonization Society has given abundant evidence, that it *acts* on the contrary blasphemous principle, as can be seen by consulting '*Jay's Inquiry*,' and other anti-slavery publications. It also assumes without the slightest proof, or effort or offer of an experiment, that it is *impossible* to elevate the coloured race here, in their native land, to the respectability and dignity of freemen, where means are abundant for that purpose; but affirms that the same thing can easily be done in Africa, amid pestilence, want and barbarism! It considers their degradation here as an ordination of Divine Providence; and therefore censures their native elevation, as wrong in principle! It declares the free blacks of this country, to be excessively dissipated, ignorant, depraved and degraded, so much so as to be real nuisances; but affirms that they will make excellent missionaries, to evangelize the African heathen! It opposes all plans of emancipation at home: and proposes to drive the free coloured people to Africa, by means of the persecution, of public sentiment and legislation united! All these and other enormities, under the mask of philanthropy for the oppressed and degraded coloured people amongst us, are fully proved against the Society, in said publications. And these have also proven, that the real though partially concealed object, of the whole colonization scheme, is to persecute the free coloured people out of the country, in order to render the enslaved condition of the remainder, still more secure and hopeless! It is a scheme originally devised by the slaveholders, to perpetuate slavery in the slave states!

The slaveholders consider the presence of the free blacks, a nuisance to slavery in the slave states. This presence renders the slaves more uneasy, discontented and rebellious, than they

otherwise would be. Hence the anxiety of the slaveholders, to send the free negroes out of the country, so that slavery may be more secure than it now is. Hence too the origin, of all the fine colonization stories published at the north, to gull the unsuspecting northern people, into the support of the project. This is the true secret of the whole scheme. The slaveholders in the mean time, have not the slightest desire of a general emancipation, or intention to promote it. On the contrary, during the whole time the colonization scheme has been in operation, they have strove by all the means in their power, to extend and secure the practice of slavery. Abundant proof of these scandalous facts, is contained in the [illegible] mentioned publications.

The Society is thus a real enemy of the coloured race, under the mask of friendship for them. I have already alluded to the wicked prejudices existing in the country against the rights and happiness of these unfortunate people. These wicked prejudices the Society indulges, fosters and encourages; declaring them to be invincible. It does nothing to counteract them, as in christian duty it is bound to do; but much to stimulate and increase them. It does not admit the coloured people as a party to the scheme. The real wishes of those people are never consulted by it. For though it *professes* to desire to transport none without their free consent, it yet encourages prejudice and persecution, to extort that consent; or to use an Irish phrase, it endeavours 'to force the proposed emigrants to turn *volunteers*.' It is similar to promises obtained by duress of threats, or false imprisonment, vide 1 Blac. Com. 131. The Society well knows, and acts upon the knowledge, that in the present persecuted condition of the coloured people of this country, not one of them *can* give an intelligent, voluntary consent. Such consent requires perfect political freedom. Some sort of force or compulsion must be used, to induce the American negroes, to emigrate to the barbarous continent of Africa. Under their present circumstances, African colonization is to them real banishment. And a man or a Society, who will directly or indirectly, assist to banish innocent persons, guilty of no crimes to merit such treatment, and merely because tyrants wish to have them removed, adds insult to injury, and deserves to be considered and treated as their real enemy; as the negroes have ever considered the Colonization Society. Also, a real friend will never foment and encourage wicked prejudices against us. There is no worse persecution on earth, than that of unjust, wicked public sentiment; as all who have experienced it will testify. And none but real enemies are ever known, to excite or increase such a sentiment against others.

Hence too the reason, why most of the *aristocracy*, or the wealthy, proud and great men of the country, approve of the scheme. Those residing at the south and with whom the scheme originated, wish to drive the free coloured people out of the country, for the reason above given; and their northern associates sympathise with them. These two parties form the body guard of the enterprise. They have proposed some ostensibly *good* objects in the scheme, which are pushed forward on all occasions at the north, to veil their real designs. These are, the civilization and conversion of Africa, and the suppression of the slave trade. These are good objects; but they cannot be the real or principal ones with the slaveholders. For very few of these, as has been abundantly proved, have any intention of sending their *slaves* to Africa.—Not a single president of the Society has ever liberated a slave, on condition of emigration to Liberia. Such a measure would ruin them. A general colonization of the slaves, would depopulate and lessen the slave states. The circumstances and wants of the slaveholders are such, as to raise the presumption, that were slavery to be abolished immediately, and the offer be made to the southern planters, to transport all the coloured people in the slave states, to Africa or elsewhere out of the country, and provide well for them, they would fight if necessary, to retain them in the country! Bond or free, they cannot live a month without them.

It is hardly worth while at the present time, to be at the pains of a very critical and elaborate examination, of the merits or rather demerits, of the Colonization Society. Its fraudulent objects and tendency have been so thoroughly exposed, as to destroy much of its pernicious influence. A general survey of its professions and principles, will suffice for this work. And it will do the justice to its northern supporters, to express my belief, that the motives of the great majority if not all of them, have been honest. They have merely been the dupes of the slaveholders; having been cheated into the support of the iniquitous project, by the falsest pretences and representations.

The *futuity* of the Society appears wonderful however, on the supposition that it is honest.—The pretended project itself, of transporting 3,000,000 of human beings across the wide Atlantic, is far beyond the ability of the whole country united; as the simplest calculations will show. And could it be done, it is yet physically certain, that most of the emigrants must perish, in the exchange of countries. And the pretence that they *cannot* be elevated at home, where a hundred times more means exist for that purpose, than are to be found in Africa; and where half the means expended, will do more than the whole will there, is so absurd and foolish as must condemn it, unless some *necessity* as is falsely pretended, sanctify the scheme. And no other necessity has been pretended by the Society, but the pretended necessary degradation of the coloured people *here*; which pretended necessity it endeavours to increase. Yet not a single honest or even plausible reason can be rendered, why the coloured people should not, with

qual rights, advantages and mental culture, make equally as good, as useful and as *respectable* citizens, as the whites. They have hitherto been the most useful laborers in the country. Nor can any honest reason be rendered, why they should remain degraded. God has not degraded them. He has created them in His own image, endowed them with all the human faculties, and made them heirs of immortality. Degradation does not depend on colour. It is an artificial thing entirely. All slaves whether white or black, are degraded; by their *condition*. Besides, the injury the project would produce to the country, could it be carried into effect, by removing the best portion of its agricultural laborers, is manifest on the slightest examination.— Were two or three millions of our slaveholders, speculators, monopolists, spendthrifts, debauchees, dandies and other drones, who spend more than they earn, are accustomed to live without labor on the earnings of others, and would be a curse to any country, to be colonized in Africa, or any where else out of the country, the latter might not sustain any serious loss.— It might be a good riddance. But to colonize the best part of its productive population, is the madness of folly. *In a state of freedom*, one black laborer would be worth more than two white ones, in the hot regions of the south; because black laborers only can endure the climate; and because they have far more skill in the kind of labour required. The negroes may as well be useful in America as in Africa. And it is certain, that the great mass of the slaveholders, have no more intent or desire, to part with their slaves, than with their own wives and children. Such deprivation would beggar them. It would reduce the value of their real estate to a trifle; besides cutting off their necessary means of subsistence. Nothing short of infatuation can be supposed, to have seized the intelligent portion of the Society, on the supposition that they have been well informed on the subject, and influenced by none but honest motives. The slaveholders have not been thus infatuated. It has never been *slavery*, but free negroes they have desired to be rid of. There is good reason to believe, that many honest persons have enlisted in the enterprise, without sufficient examination.

The ostensibly benevolent pretence, of furnishing the negroes with 'a home' on the wild shores of Africa, their 'native' country as it is foolishly called, is set up to flatter the American free negroes, into an acquiescence in the scheme; the inference always being, that they have *no right* to 'a home' in their real native country. This strange logic has not however, had the effect to gull the negroes. Their own good sense taught them its falsity; and they were the first to protest against the whole scheme. By the laws of God, every innocent person has a Divine right, to a secure and permanent 'home' of his own choosing, ANY WHERE he pleases on the whole globe, wherever chance or choice may direct his domicil; as was shown in the first Lecture. And in most of all places, is a man justly entitled to a safe and sacred 'home,' in his own native country. Our black countrymen are Americans; not Africans; and as such are entitled to an American 'home'; where God has given them a right to stay and reside as long as they choose. The country needs their presence and assistance, as much as those of her other children. What would be thought of the foolery, of proposing 'a home' in England, France or Germany, to Americans of English, French or German extraction? Would they respect such a proposal, any more than the American negroes do? Surely not.

The *crime* of the colonization scheme consists, in offering civil liberty to the coloured people, *upon condition;* which liberty those people have a Divine right to without condition. Conditional liberty to innocent persons, is not the liberty that God gave to mankind; and which it is His will they should all enjoy, except when it is forfeited for crimes. For man therefore to annex any conditions whatever, to the enjoyment of liberty by innocent persons, except that of good behaviour; and especially so hard & unreasonable a condition, as expatriation from one's own native country, is conduct highly blasphemous. It is a direct infringement of a Divine Right. Coloured people as well as others, have a Divine right to the enjoyment of civil liberty every where; and the same right to live any where they please, in the enjoyment of unconditional liberty, unless forfeited by real crimes. So long as they remain innocent persons, they inherit the Divine right of unconditional civil freedom; and on any part of the globe where they choose to live. They hold this right in common with the rest of mankind; and for the Colonization Society or any body else to deny it, is open blasphemy. To say or pretend, that coloured people have *no right* to freedom and equal rights in their own native country, when God says they HAVE, is the most daring impiety that men can utter.

The great argument used by the Colonization Society, to induce the free coloured people of this country, to emigrate to Liberia is, that the prejudices of the white people against them are *invincible;* which prejudices it endeavours, by calumnious and wicked means to increase. This is adding insult to injury; the common policy of tyrants. And these prejudices are said to be so strong, that their rights *must be* forever trampled on here; and that the prejudice being natural, the whites are as it were, *compelled* to abuse the black race; and it is therefore the duty of the latter, to flee to the place of refuge, so benevolently and providentially provided for them in Africa, where they can be secure from the effects of this destructive agent. This has been I have no doubt, the honest reasoning of thousands. They confound the antipathy against supposed bodily deformities, with the prejudice against *rights;* and believing the one to be natural and therefore invincible, they suppose the other is also.

A little reflection will convince every candid mind, that colour or other supposed bodily deformity, is not the foundation of the prejudices against the rights of black people. It has nothing to do with them. Prejudices against *rights*, arise wholly from *condition*. The prejudices against the Jews, are in many parts of the world, as strong as those against negroes. So are those against enslaved whites. So are those of aristocrats, against the lower grades of society. The prejudices of caste in the East Indies, are as strong as those of our slavery. Nor will any kind of colonization destroy them. A much stronger agency is required for that purpose.—Nothing but the POWER OF GOSPEL TRUTH, will destroy this and other wicked prejudices.

With regard to the alleged invincibility, of the natural antipathy to the black colour, and other supposed bodily deformities of black people, there are a variety of opinions, according as facts militate one way or another. The disgust and repugnance they are said to occasion, were however no hindrance, to their kidnapping and importation at a vast expence, *as slaves*. And it is certain, that this alleged antipathy it yet vincible enough, to permit a general amalgamation in the slave states. Nor is it thought of as the slightest objection, to that kind of 'social intercourse', that must always exist between masters and slaves. Other facts might be introduced to vary the argument. And if the black colour be held as a good reason for colonization, it is certainly a reasonable question to ask, why not colonize black cattle and horses, and black clothes and furniture? Why not expatriate the black colour entirely? All will however agree, that if the white prejudices against the *rights* of the coloured people, really are invincible, they ought if possible, to be permanently separated from the white race. It is an unfortunate circumstance however, that if this pretended invincibility be a fact, mere location in Africa will not shield the negroes from it. It will follow them thither, as avarice has already done; and thus the humane project of the benevolent colonizationists, be entirely frustrated!

We often hear the *hatred* of the whites to the blacks spoken of. But in the name of reason and humanity, what should they 'hate' the negroes *for*. For their black colour and curly hair? This would be to hate and of course to blaspheme, God's providence. Besides, it is simple and ridiculous; as if there was any thing in *colour* worthy of hatred! And in fact, we never hate the black colour in any other case. And yet we bear the hatred of the black race spoken of, as if it was something *natural*. But if this be so, how come the whites to bring them into the country at a vast expence? Was this done out of hatred? And why do they now extend the bounds of negro slavery? And what have the negroes done since their abode here, that deserves *hatred*? Ought they to be hated, because they have toiled from generation to generation without wages, for the sole benefit of those who hate them! Because they have supported themselves and the whites both, solely by their own labour! Because they have done far more to feed, clothe and enrich the country, than any other class of equal numbers? Because they have generally been peaceable and submissive, under the greatest oppression? Does *such* conduct deserve HATRED! Besides, to *hate* people for their *good* works or behaviour, is most daring blasphemy; vide Matt. xxiii 29—38, John x 31—39, xv 24, 25, Acts iii 14, 15, vii 51—54 1 John iii 12, and many other passages. It is returning evil for good; the peculiar malevolence of the devil. Nor can this kind of hatred be accounted for, except on the admission of the fact, that slavery is the offspring of hell. Yet the Colonization Society justifies, encourages and increases this blasphemous hatred, as a justifiable *means*, of driving the free blacks of this country to Liberia! The whites unjustly hate the blacks; and because they do thus hate them, the Society says they have a right to oppress them! This is Colonization morality!

If it be alleged that means can be used in *Africa*, to remove prejudice and repel this 'hatred,' the ready question is, why not use the same means *here*? Will it be more difficult to do so?—These inquiries are real posers, and cannot be satisfactorily answered. But it is unnecessary for me to argue the case further; for I hold this pretended invincibility, of prejudice against *rights*, to be a mere phantom or nonentity; as much so as witchcraft, knight errantry, the philosopher's stone or the perpetual motion is. It is just as easy to respect the rights of one man as another.

The respect men pay to each others rights, if not otherwise voluntary, depends on the operation of Law. Owing to the weakness and wickedness of human nature, there is a constant tendency in mankind, to invade each others rights; which tendency is held in check, controlled and regulated, by the power of the LAW. Men respect each others rights, if not from the influence of virtuous principles and reverence to the Laws of God, yet because they are forced to do so by this power. And if through weakness the law cannot compel this respect, it is always made stronger till it can. Nor has bodily deformity any thing to do with the matter.—Had the laws of this country been always made, without reference to colour or condition, nobody would have imagined there was a greater tendency or propensity, to infringe the rights of one race than another. And were the laws now to be made, without regard to persons, (as they ought to be, to conform to God's will,) this jack-o-lantern of invincibility would disappear in a week. We might not like the *looks* of the 'niggers' any better than before; but we would feel no more disposition to wrong them on that account, than we would each other on account of colour.

Why do men respect each others rights at all? It is chiefly because the Law stands ready to avenge wrongs. It is because laws and penalties, judges and juries, sheriffs and courts, jails and penitentiaries, whipping posts and gibbets, are prepared for offenders. These are the effective agents that regulate vicious society, and strike terror into rogues; and are as potent against evil prejudices, as against other evil propensities. Without these legal bulwarks against tyranny, the mass of the white people would be quickly enslaved. Their colour would afford them no more protection here, than it does in Russia and Turkey. Let the coloured people have their protection, and they will be as effectually shielded from the effects of prejudice here, as they can be in Africa or any where else.

In illustration of this doctrine, let us consider the case of the Colonization Society itself.—The most bitter and inveterate prejudices exist against it; and yet it exists and operates in peace and security, for the reason just given. It is protected by law. But according to its own theory, it ought to be colonized! For the real object of the Society is so excessively wicked and mean, that the honest and enlightened prejudices existing against it, must doubtless be invincible. It *must* be obnoxious to these prejudices; and it cannot escape from them, unless it be removed to some distant region. And I have sometimes ironically proposed, to colonize the Colonization Society, in the north part of Siberia; or in the regions near the north pole, lately discovered by Sir James Ross! In those realms of desolation, as dark and frozen as its own philanthropy, the Society if it can exist at all, can do so without prejudice!

According to the spirit of this strange pretence, all the federalists, democrats and whigs, all sectarians and partizans, all the masons and anti-masons, all foreigners, all the yankees and slaveholders, and in fact almost every body else, ought to be sent out of the country and colonized, on account of the inveterate prejudices existing against all of them! The colonizationists ought at all events to be colonized, because the just prejudices against them are inveterate, and are constantly increasing. But as the prejudices against the abolitionists are subsiding, and will in a few years become extinct, perhaps *they* ought not to be colonized!

For the same sagacious and benevolent reason, Gen. Jackson, Mr. Webster, Mr. Clay, Mr. Van Buren and many other eminent individuals, ought to be colonized; for the strongest prejudices exist against them. And it will hardly answer for the sagacious colonizationists, to pretend this to be unnecessary, on account of the rights of these gentlemen being protected by the *law*. For the saucy abolitionists would be sure to reply; that *such protection is all the coloured people need!*

2d Obj.—*Incapacity of Negroes.*

It has been a prevailing opinion among the white people of this country, that the black race are *naturally* inferior in the intellectual powers, to the white race; and many argue on this supposition, that it must therefore be right and proper, to deprive them of all rights and treat them as brutes; or, in other words, to enslave them.

Suppose this false notion were true, and what would it prove? Why that all men of inferior talents ought to be enslaved! And as most men possess but ordinary talents, in comparison of a small portion of the whole number, it would render human slavery almost universal. Republicans ought therefore to spurn the notion, whether it be true or false. It is the old aristocratic pretence, made use of by aristocrats all over the world, to justify them in oppressing the multitude; and white men are as much interested to repel it as black ones. The aristocrats assume without proof, that the multitude are inferior to themselves, not only in wealth but talents; and thence argue, that it is right and agreeable to the 'natural order of society,' to grind the poor down 'to keep their proper places.' They argue a natural, from an artificial inferiority of their own producing. By means of oppressive laws, they first degrade the multitude into compulsory poverty and ignorance, thus producing an *artificial* inferiority in them, and then falsely pretend they are *naturally* inferior to themselves. The argument is just as good and answers all aristocratic purposes just as well, in Europe as in America. It is nex-

or used with reference to colour, except in this country. *Condition*, produced wholly by artificial means, is the only real ground for the pretence any where.

And if the pretence be true, what are we to believe of the pretence, *of danger* from it? If negroes like the brute creation, are such inferior creatures as to justify their enslavement there can be nothing real in those pretended or apprehended dangers, the slaveholders make such an uproar about. Their alarms must be all nonsense and fiction. Were all the domestic animals in the country, to be turned 'loose' at once, there would be no more danger than there was before. Besides, if the pretence be true, whence proceed the dangers of negro slavery? For all slaveholders admit these to be very great; as their habitual conduct proves, and as all the barbarous and expensive means used to protect and support the practice prove. And black slavery is as dangerous as white slavery; and the latter was very dangerous to ancient Rome, (the clay in the feet of the image: Dan. ii 33—45,) and other nations. But there never was any danger from brute slavery, though the practice of it has always been universal. One of two things is certain; either that negroes are equal to other people in intellect, or that there is no danger at all, either in their slavery or its abolition; and the slaveholders may choose which horn of the dilemma they please.

And this pretence of inferiority is directly contradicted, by all the *recommendations* contained in advertisements, of negro sales, auctions &c. The slaves are usually described in such advertisements, as possessing uncommonly superior human qualities; such as 'likely', 'smart', 'very intelligent', 'honest', 'skillful', 'experienced', 'ingenious', 'excellent', 'first RATE' hands, cooks, grooms, coachmen, teamsters, nurses, seamstresses, MECHANICS, ENGINEERS &c. &c. No higher recommendations of the kind, can be given to white persons. Runaway slaves are also frequently advertised, as possessing superior abilities, cunning and enterprise. Nor is any complaint ever made, that these statements are erroneous or fond to imposition. The slaves are usually described *as superior human beings*; and the descriptions are never contradicted or questioned, or their general accuracy doubted. And such descriptions are the settled custom of the slave states; and the existence of the custom proves the utter falsity, of the absurd pretence under consideration. And it also proves, the abundant ability of our slaves, to 'take care of themselves' and easily provide for their support, in a state of freedom and equal rights. No people are found half as able to provide for themselves, as those who possess the very qualifications for that purpose, described in these glowing advertisements. — After making full allowance for the usual exaggerations of such descriptions, they afford abundant evidence of the full equality, of the black with the white race, in mental as well as bodily capacity. The testimony of the slaveholders themselves, is thus abundantly sufficient, to refute and demolish this lying pretence; vide Job xv 6, Luke xix 22.

The practice of national self government, is universally admitted to exhibit the highest human capacity. In this great art, the African savages manifest as much skill as either red or white savages, or as our ancestors did in Cæsar's time. But the republic of St. Domingo exhibits a fair specimen, of as great capacity and refinement in the art of government, as the average of the governments of white nations. It has a better government and laws, than one half of the European nations; and this too adopted by a nation of ignorant negroes, under many discouraging circumstances.

There is also strong circumstantial evidence from ancient history, that the black race were the original founders of the arts and sciences. Were this fact certainly known to be true, it would prove this race to possess superior talents and genius. For the first original discoveries in any art or science, however rude and imperfect they may be, are by far the most difficult of any, and require a degree of genius, which history shows to be so rare. But however this may be, there is nothing in the behaviour, actions, character or *condition* of the black race, that denotes their natural inferiority to any of the other races. In every department of human enterprize, they have been permitted to occupy in civilized society, they have proved themselves to possess first rate capacity, their enemies themselves being judges; a fact which demonstrates, that they only need a fair opportunity, to exhibit the same capacity in all the other departments

These facts show the utter falsehood of this base pretence. The poor are not *naturally* inferior to the rich, as the aristocrats pretend. The black race are not *naturally* inferior to the white, in any respect whatever. All the apparent inferiority of the negroes is wholly artificial. The Almighty has given to all men without distinction, the same general measure of native ability, both bodily and mental, to enable them to obey His Law, and fulfil His Will; thereby intimating in the strongest manner, the natural equality of their *rights;* as was stated in the First Lecture. All *slaves* both black and white, deprived of literary leisure and knowledge, bereft of hope and crushed by cruel oppression, *appear* stupid, careless and thoughtless; but none of them are *naturally* inferior to the rest of mankind. All they need to manifest a perfect equality is, an equality of rights and knowledge. These equalities are reciprocal; and the allowance of the one will always produce the other. Riley and Robins were as abject slaves among the Arabs, as the negroes are in our slave states. So were the Helots and Roman slaves, the whole of whom were white people. The pretended *natural* inferiority of the black race, is all moonshine; as those who are well acquainted with them are aware. There is nothing artificial of which white people are capable, but of which black ones are just as capable. In every department of art or science, of literature and learning, the blacks are just as capable of excellence as the whites. Their natural abilities both of body and mind are just as perfect. There is no truth in the pretence, of the inferiority of their *anatomical* structure and organization. The facial angle is usually smaller in the black than in the white race; but there is as great a proportion of retreating foreheads, in the one race as in the other. The most extensive anatomical researches have demonstrated, that there is no essential difference, in the size, shape or composition of the brain, in any of the races. There are all sorts of heads and phrenological indications in all the races, and the same proportional variety in each; as a critical investigation will prove. It is my long settled opinion, that all the physiological differences among the different races, are entirely the effect of differences in climates. But however or whatever the real causes may be, it is demonstrably certain, that there is not the slightest difference of human identity or capacity, in any of the races.

3d Obj.—*Imprudence.*

By this objection is not meant those casual errors, which the best of men will sometimes commit in the best of causes; and from which owing to human infirmity, even the wisest are not exempt,—vide Rom. vii 18—24. A *criminal*, wicked 'imprudence' is in the sense of the objection, always insinuated against the abolitionists. Their enemies will never specify, and state *wherein* their 'imprudence' consists; but merely repeat the stale excuse, that they 'like their principles, but not their measures.'

And what is the 'nature of the 'imprudence' charged by this pretence? *Imprudence*, to obey the commands of God, by 'opening our mouths for the dumb', 'remembering those that are in bonds &c.'; and a hundred others similar! *Imprudence*, to imitate the example of our Saviour, and that of his followers the prophets, apostles and martyrs! *Imprudence*, to obey the commands of God, in preference to those of wicked men! *Imprudence*, to preach righteousness, in spite of the threats of such men! *Imprudence*, to practice the Golden Rule! *Imprudence*, to discharge plain Divine duty! &c. For this is all the 'imprudence' the abolitionists are honestly and justly chargeable with. One cannot but help reflect here, how very 'imprudent' in the view of the virtuous objectors, must have been the conduct of Christ and his followers; and that of all great moral and political reformers since.

And we are sometimes told, that if the abolitionists will only stop preaching and discontinue their exertions, the mob will let them alone, and they can live safe and secure. That is to say, if they will only give up the discharge of Divine duty, and the exercise of a Divine and constitutional right, and obey the will of wicked men instead of God's will, they can be *safe!* And so may every reformer be 'safe', on the same wicked condition. All that is necessary to ensure *such* 'safety', is simple submission to the arbitrary dictates, of every tyrant that threatens. Our revolutionary fathers might readily have obtained this kind of 'security' by submitting to

all the usurpations of the British government; and been 'secure' from time to time, till they had nothing left to be secured. Peace on such terms is submission to despotism, such 'peace' as the Turkish and Russian slaves enjoy. And what real 'security' is there in *false* peace vide Jer. vi 14, viii 15, Eze. xiii 10, 16. It is better to have no peace at all, than such a conditional 'peace' as this. Open war is always better than such 'peace'. We must always expect contention with moral corruption, if we do our duty by opposing it.

Yet most opposers of abolition contend, that the abolitionists have pursued most 'imprudent' reckless, 'incendiary' *measures*, in the profession of good principles, regardless of consequences; that they have denounced slavery and slaveholders, with the severest censure and the bitterest invective; and therefore *something* is wrong; and that must be, the spirit of abolition. A cause which requires or permits the aid of such *violent* support, must be a bad cause. This is the inference commonly insinuated.

Now all this clamor is caused by the simple fact, that the only violence of the abolitionists, is the violence of the truth. The only force they have ever used, is the force of the truth. They do not use or pretend to use any other. *And this is the only force their enemies fear from them.* They fear the arguments of the abolitionists, and the power of the truths they proclaim. 'The heat which offends the opposers of abolition, is the ardor of conviction, and that zeal for the service of righteousness, that neither hope nor fear can influence the abolitionists to suppress.' The words of the great Pitt are strictly applicable, to the nature of the zeal that animates the present abolitionists. To put a stop to the exhibition of arguments they can neither refute nor endure, the enemies of abolition have invented this and other false charges.

So also the abolitionists have been accused, of wild enthusiasm and visionary fanaticism; a charge which has never been attempted to be proven. But are they more enthusiastic than the prophets, apostles and martyrs were? vide 1st Cor. ii 2, Phil. iii 7, and numerous other passages. Or than Luther and the other protestant reformers were? Or than our revolutionary fathers were? Or than good men engaged in good causes usually have been? Or was any good cause ever more deserving, of all the enthusiasm inspired by it, than that of the abolition of American slavery? No honest man can believe, that the abolitionists possess too much enthusiasm. But very few of them have enough.

But for argument's sake, suppose these false charges to be true; and what then? Because abolitionists in some respects do wrong, is abolition itself therefore wrong? If it is, christianity must be wrong, for the same reason; for a great many christians frequently do wrong!— And so must infidelity, federalism and democracy, masonry and anti-masonry, banking, common schools, and every thing else that men engage in; for what is there even though it be good in itself, that men use, that they do not abuse? For though the command be otherwise, (1 Cor. vii 31,) yet it is certain that men abuse all the blessings they possess. How for instance, is the excellent art of printing abused. How many lies and bad books are printed. Ought we therefore to break all the printing presses and types, and destroy the art itself, for fear it may be still further abused. And should we destroy the other arts and sciences for the same reason! Was the cause of our revolutionary fathers wrong, because they sometimes acted wrong in that cause? Was the reformation wrong because it was abused? Has the conduct of its friends any relation, to the merits of any cause whatever? Most certainly not. Any cause may be good or bad in itself, let the conduct of its friends be what it will. This objection certainly proves far too much to be good for any thing. It is in fact too ridiculous to merit serious refutation, even if it were as true as it is false.

According to the spirit of this despicable pretence, no person ought to unite with any sect or party, or other association, no matter how just, pure, honest and useful their objects or intentions may be, because some of his associates must and will do wrong! He must be neither whig nor democrat, mason nor anti-mason, methodist nor presbyterian, nor any thing else in *company* or union with others, for fear of being exposed to their errors and follies!— He must become a complete moral, political and intellectual nonentity, for fear of coming in to contact with human infirmity and corruption! He ought in fact, to become a hermit or voluntary outcast from all human society. Where would have been the christian religion and

all other good institutions, had their founders acted on this principle! United action for all good, righteous and benevolent purposes whatever, is the spirit of the whole Scriptures; vide Ps. cxxxiii 1, Eph. iv 3—6, 13, 16, and numerous other passages.

And it has been objected to the abolitionists, that they have given *great offence* to others.—Undoubtedly the proclamation of the truth and righteousness by them, has been excessively offensive to the slavish corruptions of the country, and to the spirit of slavery every where existing in it. It always had that effect. Such proclamation was offensive to Pharaoh, to Herod, to the Jews, to Nero, to the Pope and the Romish church in Luther's time, and to all other corruptionists; as it is now to the American slaveholders and their supporters; and for the same reason; because they are *corrupt*, and the truth condemns and reproaches them; vide Matt. ii 3, 16, xiv 3, 4, Mark vi 17—27, Acts iv 1—3, vi 10—14, vii 54—59, and a great many other passages. The proclamation of the truth has generally been more offensive to the guilty, than that of falsehood to the innocent; because there has always been more guilt than innocence in the world. But ought such proclamation to be discontinued for *this* reason? Nay, verily, it is the strongest reason for its increase; for the more corruption there is in the world, the more strongly does it need resistance and exposure. It offends nothing but moral corruption; and therefore gives no criminal offence. See the following among other passages: 2d Cor. xiii 10, 1st Tim. v 20, 2d Tim. iv 2, 3, Tit. i 13, James iv 7 &c. Such was the conduct of all the prophets and apostles, and of all great and good reformers since. And their example is in strict accordance with the whole spirit of christianity.

But the objection is as essentially false as it is absurd and contemptible. To say that no abolitionist had at any time, said or done any thing respecting slavery or its abolition, that was wrong or imprudent, would doubtless violate the truth. 'To err is human', and the abolitionists as such lay no claim to perfection. If the great apostle was so very imperfect as he represents himself to be, (Rom. vii 15—24,) much more ought we all to tremble for our own imperfections. The abolition cause like every thing else in which human agency mingles, is doubtless conducted with some degree of imperfection. The duty of christian prudence is also strongly enjoined in the Scriptures; vide Matt. x 16, Rom. xvi 19, 1st Cor. xiv 20, Phil. ii 15, and many other passages. The spirit of these commands is, to be prudent in keeping ourselves pure and avoiding sin. But the spirit of the whole Scriptures also is, to rebuke and denounce sins, especially great and customary sins, with the most unsparing severity,—vide 2d Sam. xii 7—12, Isa. lviii 1 &c., Jer. xiv 14, 15, 16, Ezek. xi 5—12, xiii 1—23, Matt. xxiii 13—33, Luke xi 39—52, Acts. xiii 10, Eph. v 11, Tit. i 13, and a thousand other passages. The Bible goes to the utmost 'extremes', against sins of every description. And all the woes and denunciations of the Sacred Volume are *personal*, being levelled against the transgressors themselves. That Book contains no abstractions. The 'abusive language' of the abolitionists is complained of. But have they ever said or published any thing more 'abusive', than the language of the passages quoted, or of many others that might be quoted?—Or were the abominations rebuked in those passages, greater than those of American slavery? Or is it an 'abuse' of language in reproving sin, to call things by their true names, as the Bible always does? If it is, then the spirit of the Scriptures is much more 'abusive' than the abolitionists are.

Nor is there any exception to this mode of denouncing sins in the Scriptures. The Saviour and all the prophets and apostles pursued no other. And in the language of this undisguised denunciation, we discover curious traces of the natural disposition, of each speaker or writer. The sublime and poetic Isaiah, the melancholy Jeremiah, the ferocious Ezekiel, the grave, learned and eloquent Paul &c., all pursued one method in opposing sin, namely, open sharp rebuke, without any qualification, compromise or reserve. And the prophets and apostles were commissioned and sent to pursue this course, *as examples for universal imitation*: vide 1st Tim. iv 12, Heb. xi 33—40, xii 1 &c. and other passages. A compromising spirit with iniquity is not taught in the Bible. The Acts of the Apostles are full of instruction on this point. The christian 'prudence' of the apostle Paul, exposed him to constant danger and suffering, in the exercise of it: vide Acts. xiv 19 &c., xvi 19—24, xvii 13 &c., xix 23-41, xxi

[illegible]-36, xxiii 12 &c., 2d Cor. [illegible] 23-27, 2d Tim. iii 11 &c. [illegible] the [illegible] of Luther and the other great reformers, frequently exposed them to the greatest dangers; as it will every body that pursues it in the spirit of the Scriptures.

Neither the invectives of Garrison nor Bourne, nor of any other anti-slavery writer or speaker, strong as they are, have ever equalled the severity of the invective in the passages quoted. No uninspired writers can equal the severity of such denunciation. The reason of this severity is obvious. No other method will reach and expose and reform, great and habitual transgressors. When the conscience has become stupified and as it were dead, from long indulgence in crime, unless it be roused by a voice of thunder, it will still sleep on. It is an invariable rule in the medical art, that 'the remedy must always be equal to the disease'. If the disease be violent, let the remedy be what it will, it must be violent also; as all intelligent physicians know. It is in the moral as in the physical world. Moral remedies for great and inveterate sins, must be violent and powerful. Unsparing severity of denunciation against such sins, is therefore the uniform direction of God's Word. *And a contrary course is denounced as a great sin;* vide Isa. xxx 10, Jer. v 31, vi 13, viii 10, xxiii 11-16, 25-32, and numerous other passages. Unceasing agitation and trouble in the practice of sin, is also a plain doctrine of the Bible; vide Job xv 20, Prov. xxviii 1, Isa. lvii 20, 21. Smooth, deceitful preaching accommodated to the corruptions of the times, as most modern preaching to some extent is, is represented in the passages quoted, as among the greatest of sins. Its opposite must therefore be a great virtue and duty. None of the abolitionists have therefore ever erred in the severity of their invectives against the damning sin of slavery. On the contrary, most of them have erred and erred greatly, in not having denounced it with much greater severity than they have done.

The Law of Nature thus agrees in this respect, with that of Revelation. And the agreement is still further manifested by the fact, that open, sharp, unsparing rebuke, is also the safest as well as most effectual course, for those who administer it. A timid, temporizing, mild, conciliatory, respectful mode of treating slavery, will not secure the respect of slaveholders. They despise such conduct as mean, cowardly and inconsistent. They know that the pursuit of this course by the Colonization Society, has not had the slightest tendency to abolish slavery; but the reverse; and they despise that Society accordingly. They fear and hate but secretly respect, the bold uncompromising abolitionists; but despise and scorn all temporisers.

I have heard many pretend to approve abolition principles, who yet affected to find fault with the *way* and *manner* of abolitionists. When pressed to explain, and specify wherein the abolition means and modes were defective, I have never found one who could object any thing of importance to them, unless that they were too violent. This habitual evasion is only proof to me, of the hypocrisy of such pretenders. If they really saw and believed the ordinary means and modes of abolition to be wrong, it would be easy for them to specify wherein.— And the fact that they are unable thus to specify, proves those means and modes to be right and that they know it. They know they cannot point out any better way. Because there is none; it being God's own appointed 'way'. And it is only because any way at all, has been adopted by abolitionists to abolish slavery, that these despicable hypocrites make this false pretence. They have no method of their own for such a purpose; and are sorely offended that any body else has.

Voluntary obedience to wicked laws and customs, is also falsely pretended by some, to be a Bible doctrine; the pretenders perverting the following portions of Scripture for that purpose; Matt. xxii 21, Rom. xiii 1-7, Tit. iii 1, 1st Pet. ii 13-15, and other passages, where the duties of good citizens and subjects are prescribed. Voluntary obedience to bad laws, is not however the spirit and meaning, of any of these passages. Voluntary submission to the *penalties* of such laws, I admit is their spirit. The conduct of our Saviour and the apostles shows that this is the real meaning. They were never known to yield a willing obedience to bad laws; but uniformly disregarded and broke them; as was shown in the First Lecture. *And they were persecuted and put to death because they did [illegible]*

on their part; thus manifesting their submission to the penalties; but not to the laws themselves. All the apostles and the other martyrs, voluntarily submitted to the *penalties* of torture and death, inflicted for the *breach* of wicked laws. The pretence then, that we are religiously bound to yield voluntary obedience to the accursed laws and customs of slavery, or to other wicked laws and customs, is as false as it is immoral and dangerous. Where human laws contradict the Divine Law, we are under a Divine obligation to disobey them.

It should be remarked in conclusion, that those sensitive and delicate objectors, to the severity of abolition invectives, are never known to find any fault, with the blasphemous scurrility and fiend-like malignity of expression, habitually employed by the slaveholders and their friends, against the abolitionists and their measures. To *this* kind of violence, they attach no 'imprudence', and see no objections! Also, that although the habitual language of slaveholders and their agents towards the helpless slaves, is the dialect of hell, consisting of the most blasphemous threats, curses and oaths, yet these tender, scrupulous, conscientious pretenders, never see any thing 'imprudent' or objectionable in it! But if such conduct and the characters of those who exhibit it, are correctly delineated and exposed by the abolitionists, even in Scripture language, the objectors denounce the descriptions as 'hard language', 'ferocious denunciation', 'unreasonable severity' &c.! vide Prov. xxviii 4, Matt. vii 3, 4, 5.

4th Obj.—*Danger.*

That the abolition principles and cause are very dangerous to *slavery*, and to all its destructive consequences and influences, is readily admitted. That it will finally put an end to the tyranny, poverty, misery and other evil fruits of the abomination, is certain. That abolition is dangerous and destructive to error, crime and unhappiness, is also certain. But that Immediate Emancipation ever was or ever will be, dangerous and destructive *to any thing good*, is positively denied. It is slavery that is dangerous to virtue, happiness and prosperity; and not its moral and political opposite,—abolition. It might as well be feared that virtue, righteousness and holiness, would be dangerous to human happiness, as that the abolition of slavery will. Abolition is a species of that righteousness, the immediate practice of which is enjoined all over the Bible. Immediate Emancipation from its nature, never did nor ever will produce any bad effect. Disobedience to God's commands only produces danger.

It has been said, that the doctrine of the paramount supremacy of the Law of God, over all the laws of men, is a very dangerous doctrine; and that the preaching of it if necessary, ought to be suppressed by law. That this doctrine is very dangerous to the practice of slavery and other crimes, is most true. It is the foundation stone of abolition and all other righteousness; and its enemies have no other means of preventing the overthrow of slavery, but to suppress the doctrine if they can. But this doctrine is the life blood, the only sure safe guard of liberty in the world; as was argued in the First Lecture. Let it be once abolished, and the whole human race will soon be divided into two classes only, tyrants and slaves. It remains now to be seen, whether infidelity and slavery united, are strong enough to suppress the preaching, of this great fundamental doctrine.

Enough has already been proved in the course of these Lectures, to satisfy every honest mind, that the apprehensions entertained by many honest but ignorant persons, of danger from *abolition*, is a mere bug-bear; just as if obedience to God's Will could produce danger! But for the sake of complete illustration, it should be stated, that there are several *special* reasons why, even if no instance of emancipation had ever occurred, we ought to believe implicitly beforehand, that though slavery is always attended with great danger, yet its immediate abolition never can be; that danger lies only in continuance in sin; not in forsaking it; as the histories of all the cases of both kinds proves.

The first and greatest of all reasons is, that we have the Express Promises of Almighty God that the righteous, voluntary abolition of slavery, shall be without danger. No greater act of *righteousness* and justice can be performed, than such abolition; and the uniform promise of the Scriptures is, all peace, safety and prosperity, to those who work righteousness

This promise is in effect if not in words, repeated in the Bible both by precept and example, a thousand times over. See the following passages: Ex. xv 26, Deut. xii 28, Ps. xi 7, xv 12, lxxii 3–7, lxxxv 10–13, cvi 3, Prov. viii 18, 20, x 2, xi 3–11, 18, 19, 20, xii 28, xiii 6, xiv 34, xvi 7, xxi 21, Isa. xxxii 17, xxxiii 15, 16, li 7, 8, liv 17, lviii 1–12, Dan. iv 27, xii 3, Matt. v 6, Acts. x 35, Rom. viii 31, xiv 17, Heb. xii 11, James iii 17, 18, 2d Pet. ii 5, &c. &c. Every case of immediate, unconditional, voluntary emancipation that has ever occurred, has demonstrated the perfect truth of this great doctrine. That of St. Domingo in 1794, those in South America, in the British West Indies and elsewhere, to the amount of millions of slaves, all resulted in the most perfect peace, harmony, good will, friendship and great prosperity and benefit, to all persons and parties concerned. Not the slightest bad effect ever followed any of them.

'*Righteousness*' is doing what is *right;* as justice is doing what is just and honest; being nearly synonymous in their meaning. I have sometimes been astonished at the conduct of some professing christians, who pretend to understand much of the Scriptures, and profess to have the most unlimited confidence in the promises of God, but yet feared danger from abolition: vide Matt. vi 30. The Scriptures threaten the greatest danger to the practice of Human Oppression; vide Job xxvii 13–23, Prov. xxviii 8, Jer. xxii 3, 5, 13, Eze. xxxiv 2–10, Amos iv 1, 2, Rom. i 18, 2d Pet. ii 13, and a great many other passages; but they uniformly teach the safety and prosperity, attending the opposite practice of righteousness; thus declaring what the Law of Nature also teaches, that only one of two moral opposites can be dangerous; because their natures being directly opposite, their effects must be opposite also. So peace and prosperity are always promised in the Scriptures, on repentance and reformation from sin; vide Eze. xxxiii 14–16, and a hundred other passages equally plain. For *christians* therefore, to pretend to fear danger from immediate abolition, is conduct most absurd and criminal. Such faithless apprehensions prove, that they doubt the veracity of the Almighty!

Nor have infidels any just reason, to indulge fears of danger from immediate abolition. For the Law of Nature which they profess to believe in, exactly corresponds with that of Revelation, in guaranteeing peace and safety as the effect of it. We know by experience and observation, that repentance and reformation from evil doing, always works peace and safety. If a person who has injured us repents, asks our forgiveness and makes us all the amends in his power, we always forgive him and forget his transgressions. Such conduct always disarms revenge instantly. It never fails of producing that effect. The Law of Nature coincides in this effect with that of Revelation; vide Rom. xii 17—21. *Bad consequences* have frequently been charged on abolition, as the effect of it. But it is impossible to prove *one* bad consequence, ever to have followed a single act of immediate, voluntary emancipation. Complete justice ever produces complete safety. The 'Horrors of St. Domingo' as they are justly called, were the result only of attempts, to reduce the negroes of that island again to slavery; as has been proven thousands of times. They were the effects of slavery; not of emancipation. So all the other pretences of such consequences, are directly contrary to all the *evidence* in the cases; and those who make the pretences, are very careful never to bring the evidence forward. The St. Domingo evidence as well as much more nearer home, proves another interesting fact, namely, that all the danger from attempts and propositions to abolish slavery, arises wholly from the *slaveholders*, and their supporters, and not from the slaves and their friends.

In further confirmation of the great doctrines here advanced, I state it as a fact, that not a single case can be found in history, where any considerable number of men, ever *knowingly* returned evil for good. History is filled with accounts, of men's knowingly returning evil for evil; but not of evil for good. By the term 'knowingly' I mean, where men *knew* beforehand, that they had received or would receive, fair, honest, righteous treatment. I will admit that many cases may be found in history, where men through ignorance and mistaken notions of duty, have returned evil for good. Such as the case of the treatment of our Saviour by the ignorant multitude, most of whom had not probably seen his miracles, and honestly believed him to be an impostor and a dangerous man. Such was the case also, of the treatment of christians by the multitude afterwards; for the same probable reasons. Such also was the case of St. Paul before his conversion; who through ignorance persecuted the christians; vide Acts xxvi 9—11, 1 Tim. i 13. And such have been the cases of the persecutions, of most reformers and useful innovators since. History contains a great many similar cases, of returns of evil for good, through mistaken notions of duty; but not *one*, where any considerable number of men rendered such return, *knowing* it at the time they did so. I will also in candor admit, that there always have been in the world and yet are, a comparatively small number of individuals, judicially hardened, having consciences 'seared as with a red hot iron,' who are wicked enough as they have opportunity, to return evil for good, and knowingly injure their greatest benefactors

These are the 'reprobates' so often described in the Scriptures, whose 'end is, the perdition of their souls.' I suspect the leaders of the multitude who crucified our Saviour, were men of this description. But what I contend for is, that no *considerable number* of men, were ever found to conduct thus. Nor can any such considerable number even among slaveholders, (unless it be in reference to their slaves,) now be found thus to act. And were any such number now to be suspected, they certainly must be among the slaveholders; for no others can be found wicked enough. And least of all men ought we to fear them, among ignorant, grateful, happy emancipated slaves.

Thus do the express promises of God, as well as His Law exhibited in His Works, equally guarantee peace and safety, as the 'fruits of righteousness;' and to abolition among the rest.—They both prove that immediate justice, is in all cases the highest expediency; because only one of two moral opposites can ever be dangerous. People sufficiently enlightened to understand these guarantees, are therefore without excuse for the indulgence, of their absurd fears of danger from abolition. They abuse their own reason and commit sin by such indulgence. They ought to have more confidence in their Maker, than thus to distrust His promises.

But aside from general laws, there are some *peculiar* circumstances in the condition of our slaves, that will insure their good behaviour after abolition. They have always been accustomed to the hardest labour and the scantiest fare; so much so, that their physical energies and warlike propensities are greatly reduced. They are wholly ignorant of the art, and possess none of the ordinary means of war. They understand none but the arts of peace; and of these none but agriculture; which and which only they understand well. They are admirably qualified to get their living and be useful, as well paid and well used agricultural laborers; but are wholly unfit for warlike purposes, without a great deal of discipline and instruction. Nothing but the desperation produced by slavish oppression, could stimulate them to rebellion and war. They are without arms and ammunition; while the whites have plenty of both. There are in the United States, at least four times as many white as black people. To pretend to fear danger under such circumstances, from a body of people thus habited and situated, and when all *motives* to create dangor are taken from them, is excessively simple, weak and cowardly. The naked truth is, there is not a particle of danger in the whole case, except of the slaveholders' own making. The only real danger is from *them;* not from any body else.

And as Mr. Burleigh justly argues; before emancipation, the slaves have *three* motives to rebel, namely, the remembrance of past, the sense of present, and the fear of future wrongs; after emancipation, but *one* of these motives will be left, and that one the weakest of the three; to wit, the recollection of past injuries.* And how soon do men forgive and forget such injuries, on the repentance and reformation of the criminal party! No case can be found where this motive alone, was when attended with such circumstances, ever found to excite revenge, Such a result is as contrary to nature as it is to Scripture. The Scriptures expressly forbid human revenge, (vide Deut. xxxii 35, Ps. xciv 1, Rom. xii 19); because men in the pursuit of revenge, are wholly unfit to do exact justice; while the Almighty alone is. Thus do the Laws of Revelation and Nature exactly harmonize in this doctrine. Immediate emancipation takes away all disposition to revenge. Gratitude and joy instead of revenge, fill the soul of the liberated slave. Besides, after emancipation, the new made freeman has much to lose by rebellion, that he had not before. His character, safety and peace, are greatly increased in value by emancipation; and he is more sure to lose by rebellion than before. It will be most for his interest to keep the peace. He will have a personal interest in the prosperity and peace of the country, that he had not before; when every thing that increased either, only strengthened his own chains. Without voluntary emancipation, war is his only chance of freedom; with it, war is his only danger of renewed slavery. By emancipation, he will enjoy all the domestic comforts of which he is now deprived, and of which rebellion would again deprive him. In short, immediate abolition will in effect, withdraw all motives to rebel, and furnish several new ones, to guarantee the good behaviour of the slaves.

But if this pretence of danger from immediate abolition be true, what becomes of the pretence of the *inferiority* of negroes? As already remarked, one pretence or the other must be false; for if the latter be true, no such danger *can* exist under any circumstances. The two pretences neutralize each other; and thus afford strong suspicion that both are false. Again, we have just proved, that the fears of danger from immediate emancipation in this country, are the most weak and cowardly that can be imagined. Yet many of the contemptible alarmists who pretend to indulge them, are among the foremost to charge the abolitionists with cowardice, for refusing to go to the south and be murdered! Cowards ought not to accuse others of cowardice. If the abolitionists be cowards, these accusers have no right to reproach them. I never had any charity for the pretended fears of such alarmists. It is not the loss of safety but of unjust power, that these corruptionists fear.

A great body of objectors to immediate abolition, on account of its alleged dangers, pretend to be in favor of *gradual* abolition; which they argue, contrary to God's promises and commands and the lights of experience, to be unattended with danger; whereas it is in truth, the only kind of emancipation that ever had or ever can have any danger in it. The principle of

gradualism is, to continue to do evil that good may come of it—which is utterly forbidden in the Scriptures; vide Rom. iii 8, vi 1, 15.

The gradualists talk of the necessity of *education*, to prepare the slaves for emancipation; whereas it is impossible to keep a great multitude of 'educated' slaves in bondage for a moment. And the slaveholders are so sensible of this fact, (and no men understand it better), that they utterly prohibit all literary instruction of their slaves, under the severest penalties. If slavery is to last for the smallest period of time, the *necessity* is, to *prohibit* all instruction during the whole period of the delay; for education during slavery would lead directly to rebellion. The slaveholders well know this; and are obliged to prohibit it for that reason. And they dread the presence of the free negroes so much, that they have fabricated the Colonization scheme, to remove them out of the country as 'nuisances.' To educate is to emancipate; and to emancipate is to elevate; and the slaveholders know it well. The practice of slavery requires the constant aid of all its 'horrors,' its whipping, starving, maiming and other criminal agents of fear; treatment to which 'educated' persons will never submit. Nor have the slaveholders the slightest intention, of permitting their slaves *while enslaved*, to receive any literary or other instruction, and become thus 'prepared' as the cant is, for emancipation; or rather rebellion. Their only chance of safety *while slavery exists*, is in keeping their slaves in the most brutish ignorance possible. Besides, were they disposed to educate their slaves, and were such education safe, they cannot afford the *time* and *expence* necessary for the purpose; both of which must be very great. For them to send all their slaves old and young to school, a sufficient time to 'educate, them, would be a dead loss to them; and is not to be thought of. Gradual abolition on the *preparatory* plan, is a chimera in every point of view; and for people to wait for it in preference to immediatism, will be like waiting for all the water in a river to flow past. So the plan of substituting 'apprenticeship' for slavery, as is done in a part of the British West Indies, by which a *part* of the wrongs and cruelties of slavery are retained, is found to produce a fruitful harvest of discord, trouble, inconvenience, cruelty and abuse, exactly in proportion to the amount of slavery retained; not of liberty enjoyed; while in the cases of total, immediate abolition, (in Antigua and Bermuda), none of these mischiefs followed. The advocacy of the immediate plan, like that of the temperance and all other reformations, will yet produce far too 'gradual' an effect, for the greatest good of mankind. The truth is, immediate emancipation is the only kind, that is perfectly practicable and safe. If our coloured population are ever to be educated, they must like their white brethren, educate themselves; and this they can only do in a state of complete freedom. The first only safe step to their elevation, is their immediate and complete emancipation. And in such a condition, they will easily educate themselves to any desirable extent, without any other assistance but what they will themselves be able to procure and support. The only people in this country, who need any 'preparation' for immediate emancipation, are the *white*, not the coloured people.

The plan of emancipating a *part at a time*, from year to year, is attended with insuperable difficulties, on account of slaveholding policy. As Mr. Birney a former slaveholder himself well remarks; it is a fixed rule of that policy, never to employ free negroes with slaves. The practice is attended with too much danger. Neither will white persons in the slave states labour with free blacks. Their society is considered too degrading. Nor will the planters employ free negroes at all on their plantations; nor will others employ them if they can avoid it. Their presence and freedom is dangerous to slavery, and the planters desire on this account, to get rid of them altogether. If therefore a *part*, say a tenth or a greater proportion of the slaves, were to be emancipated at a time, great difficulty and danger would attend the measure, on account of the slavery still existing. The emancipated portion would for want of employment at home, be compelled to emigrate to the free states, and thus the measure produce that very influx, that so many people in those states pretend to fear, as the result of total emancipation. Whereas if all the slaves were to be emancipated at once, none of these difficulties would occur. The planters would be obliged to hire their former slaves. And there being none left to be rendered uneasy by the want of freedom, there would be no objection to hiring the whole. In every view that can be taken of the case, immediate abolition will appear as the only safe kind. All attempts by men, to alter or vary with a view to improve, the mode that God has commanded, only produces new difficulties and dangers.

And yet we frequently hear of the *necessity* of the present continuance of slavery; that is, the *necessity* of crime for the support of crime! And this impious doctrine is supported by the most specious and refined sophistry. Only think of its being *necessary*, to violate the Law of God every moment, by depriving innocent human beings of the liberty and rights that God gave them; *necessary*, to compel men to labour without wages or other reward; *necessary*, to buy and sell and flog and starve and overwork them, and sever the dearest ties of nature, to be secure in the acquisition of the 'gains of oppression'; *necessary*, to forbid men to marry, to 'search the Scriptures,' to educate their children, to 'prove all things,' or to obey any of the other commands of God; *necessary*, in short, to continue in the perpetration of every crime against the Law of God, for the sake of supporting one of the greatest crimes against that Law!! What part of the Scriptures justifies *such* 'necessity'? What part of the Bible permits men to do evil

what good may grow out of it? Such a 'necessity' must be of its father the devil. It can only exist as one crime is 'necessary' to support another. Abolish the grand crime slavery, and all the other crimes 'necessary' to support it, will be unnecessary. And to what absurdities does not this abominable doctrine of gradualism lead? To think of the *necessity* of 'gradual' repentance of sin; or talk of the *necessity* of 'gradual' reformation from the crimes of murder, theft, robbery, perjury, &c.! The doctrine is far too absurd for recognition, even by human laws; much less by the Law of God. Its advocates would be ashamed of its application, to the case of any other crime except slavery.

The preaching of gradual abolition was never known, to have the slightest tendency to abolish slavery. When the slaveholders are told by the gradualists, that slavery is right under *present circumstances*, their consciences are soothed and calmed; and remain so, because they know, that so long as slavery remains, these 'circumstances' must also remain unchanged; and these remaining unchanged, perpetual slavery is right! This is the necessary tendency of gradualism; for it is impossible to practice slavery at all, and yet to change these 'circumstances'; and the slaveholders know it. The slave 'reign of terror' must continue without the least relaxation, so long as slavery itself continues, for any period of time however short. Slavery must itself be abolished, to procure the abolition of any of these 'circumstances; they being absolutely necessary to support it. Thus Wilberforce and his associates made but little progress, till they renounced the doctrine of gradualism in 1824, on the appearance of Elizabeth Heyrick's pamphlet. And American slavery never increased so rapidly, both in extent and rigor, as it did during the fifteen years, that the excellent Benjamin Lundy (than whom slavery never had a more zealous enemy) labored in Baltimore, in the cause of gradualism and colonization. His benevolent but mistaken labors, operated like an opiate on all slaveholding consciences. And it was not until the appearance of Mr. Garrison's withering invectives, proclaiming the Divine doctrine of immediate abolition, that the nation began to awake from its long slumbers, over the abominations that were hastening its own destruction.

No body supposes, that because the doctrine of immediate repentance and reformation from sin is preached, all men will immediately obey it. This would be to expect too much from corrupt human nature. Reformation is always a 'gradual' operation. So notwithstanding immediate emancipation is preached, the process will still be 'gradual'; and must be preached to procure even this; for the preaching of gradualism, will never produce any abolition at all!—Slavery will grow the faster for it. But it is the duty of all men, to preach and proclaim the doctrine of immediatism every where, because God has commanded such preaching. And it is no excuse for the neglect to preach it, that wicked men will not immediately obey it; for if it were, it could never be a duty to preach immediate repentance at all, though God has commanded such preaching to be done every where! It would render all the preaching in the world entirely superfluous!

Much alarm has been expressed, at the prospect of the liberated slaves, 'roaming about' 'loose' as it is called, stealing, burning houses, cutting throats, &c. without a particle of evidence to render such conduct probable. All that the abolitionists have ever desired to see the slaves 'loose' from, is the criminal laws and customs of slavery. They wish the slaves to be 'loose' or free from nothing but tyranny. They have never asked nor desired, to have them or any body else 'loose,' from the restraints and responsibilities of just and equal laws. No person is or ought to be 'loose' from such laws. They wish the slaves emancipated into, not from, the restraint and protection of just, impartial laws. Nor will the slaves be 'loose' from such laws after emancipation. But in the sense the alarmists intend, are not the slaves *now* 'loose'? Very few of them are confined in irons or dungeons. They are as able, and a thousand times more desirous, to rise and 'burn houses, cut throats &c. now, than they would be after emancipation. Furthermore, they have *now*, the strongest inducements that men can have, (escape from oppression), to 'roam' into the free states and elsewhere. And in fact, some fifteen thousand or more of them, have already 'roamed' away from the 'happiness' of slavery into Canada. A multitude more have from time to time, 'roamed' away from this 'happiness' into the free states; and multitudes more, perhaps the most of them, have tried the same kind of 'roaming' without success; as the whole of them undoubtedly would do, had they a fair opportunity.—But complete emancipation would destroy all motives for this roaming; and considering the strong attachment of negroes to their places of nativity, would probably put an entire stop to it.

Competition of black with white labour is another objection, not afloat so far as my information extends, by men who never cared a straw, for the effects of the competition of any labour on the poor, whether white or black, until the liberty of the slaves was talked of. They never object to the competition of white labour with itself; though the same reason exists, if there is any reason in the objection, in the one case as in the other. Nor have these alarmists ever been known, to lament the effects of slave labour, on the welfare of the poor class of whites at the south. Yet it is a notorious fact, that a multitude of poor whites of this class, are by the tendency of the slave system, to accumulate all property in a few hands, and by the monopoly of slave labour which this accumulation produces, kept in the greatest poverty, want and igno-

races. [illegible] of them to labour with slaves, and [illegible] will not have them if they can avoid it, to perform even their [illegible] drudgery, which they generally contrive to have done by their own slaves. And this lack of white labour at the south is one cause, why the slave states, *as states*, are so very poor. Thus do the poor whites in these states live, in a state of dependance bordering on pauperism; and many of them almost as ignorant and degraded as the slaves themselves. All the evils of slavery are great evils; but one of the greatest is, that it injures all the free as well as the enslaved.

The freest competition of useful labor, is most beneficial to any *country*, however injurious it may sometimes be to individuals. All economists are agreed in this maxim. Nor is it of any importance to a country, what is the colour of its laborers: unless white laborers with no more than equal advantages, are better than coloured ones: which never will nor can be proved. Nor is it any thing to the laborers, what each others' colour is. The [illegible] is as nonsensically ridiculous, as that of the competition of the labour of black and white horses. The more useful laborers a country has, the greater is its strength and wealth. Their competition is generally useful, not only to the nation, but to all the individuals [illegible]. It promotes a useful division of labor, and [illegible], the laborers themselves gain more than they lose by it. What they lose in wages, they gain in purchases. [illegible], in old thick settled countries, it is generally easier to lay up money from wages, than in [illegible]. It is the very worst policy for any of the free states, to endeavour to bar out useful laborers from their limits, whether black or white. And the cowardly and barbarous legislation in some of them, to prevent the useful competition of black and white labour, is not more injurious to the coloured people, than to those states themselves.

Every pretence that can be set up against abolition, if followed out to its [illegible], proves only, that righteousness is the only true expediency, and that immediate emancipation is the only safe and beneficial kind. Yet some corruptionists, unwilling to practise in the way of God's ordinary appointed Providence, of [illegible], affect to wait for some *special* Providence, some Divine visitation [illegible], as in Pharaoh's case; thus tempting the Almighty to destroy the country! For God has [illegible] no other kind of special providence for such a purpose, but what must work such destruction. The special *providence* of God in such cases teaches us only, that if nations will not voluntarily repent and reform from national sins, they will finally be destroyed. Pharaoh's case is directly in point, to exemplify the doctrine. The world also was destroyed by a flood, on account of the same state of society, to which these blasphemous corruptionists seem willing, that slavery should first reduce this country; vide Gen. vi 5, 11—13. And Noah was saved, because he was a 'just man,' (Gen. vi 8, 9, vii 1,) and a preacher of 'righteousness'; 2 Pet. ii 5. Many similar special providences may be found in the Bible. Most ominous passages these for those to reflect on, who incline to delay, before they practice the righteousness the Bible enjoins.

Many affect to fear, lest *democracy* should in some way or other, suffer in the great anti-slavery struggle. This is a fearful apprehension to those, who care more for their 'democracy,' than for justice, truth and righteousness. If indeed these alarmists mean, *that kind* of 'democracy' falsely so called, that tolerates and supports slavery, and seeks to perpetuate the highest kind of oppression, by preventing its abolition; and to prohibit a large portion of the native Americans, from participating in the enjoyment, of the blessings of liberty and equal rights, it must and ought to suffer: and the more it suffers the better; for it is the worst kind of despotism that ever existed. The 'democracy' of *slavery*, is the despotism of thousands of tyrants instead of one. But if it be meant that genuine democracy, whose principle tenet is 'equal rights to all mankind,' then I say, it is identical with abolition; and abolitionists are the only genuine democrats existing. The alarmists may therefore dismiss their fears, for genuine democracy, being identical in principle with immediate abolition, can never suffer from its operation. Nothing will spread the influence of *genuine* democracy as rapidly and extensively, as the practice of abolition righteousness. It is hardly necessary to add, that slavery being the moral and political antagonist, of genuine democracy and republicanism, its utter overthrow is absolutely necessary, to the secure and permanent establishment of the latter in this country.

I do not know of a more disgusting subject, than the pretended 'democracy' and 'morality' of slaveholders; of men with liberty forever on their tongues, and slavery in their hearts and practice. It is as proper to talk of the democracy and morality of thieves and robbers. Men who praise liberty but practice and defend slavery, are mere hypocrites; not democrats. Yet how common has this pretence been in this country. The lullaby has been sung for more than half a century. But there would be every way as much propriety, in proclaiming the democracy and morality of murderers, pirates, assassins, robbers, counterfeiters, forgers and other criminals. Men ought never to be called or considered as democrats, unless they *act* as such. The 'democracy' of slaveholding, is probably the most despotic and cruel *aristocracy* in the world. It has all the cruelty and other vices, and hardly any of the virtues, not even the wisdom, of other aristocracies. It oppresses and degrades both the black and white races, to the lowest degree, to pamper its own worthless and useless pride, vanity, luxury, caprice and cruelty.— And as to its 'morality,' [illegible] I have already remarked, we might as soon [illegible] to expect good moral

from a bawdy house or a camp, as from a slave plantation. They are equally the hot beds of vice and villany of every description. The pretended piety of slaveholders is exactly described in Matt. vii 15—20, xxiii 3—5, 23—28, Acts xxiii 3.

The best general answer to all pretences raised against abolition is, that the Bible *does not teach* the doctrine, of worldly expediency in the abolition of sin. This ought to be a sufficient answer to all, who believe that Book to be the Word of God. It abundantly teaches that full and immediate justice, is in all cases the highest expediency. The uniform command is, to cease sinning instantly, without any regard to imaginary evil consequences. The doctrine of such expediency was never taught by any other persons, than those who regarded more the supposed interests of men, than obedience to the commands of God. The reason of the peremptory character of the Divine commands, was doubless because it is impossible, for any evil consequences to flow from obedience to them; so inseparably has the Almighty united our Duty and Interest together. All past human experience attested by authentic history, proves the truth of this great doctrine.

I have no doubt but a good many ignorant people, who have never critically examined this subject, and understood its real merits, have entertained honest fears of abolition. But this I have constantly observed, that the greatest pretended alarmists are such as are never alarmed, for the safety and happiness of the slaves. They are in general, people who have never manifested the slightest sympathy for the oppressed. Though they have known the poor slaves to be constantly exposed, to the greatest dangers and sufferings, yet for *them* their sensibilities have never been excited. But the moment they apprehended the interests of the slaveholders to be in 'jeopardy' they felt or pretended to fear, a strong degree of sympathy and alarm for them. And it is clear, that this sympathy has arisen, from a fear of the abolition of sin, and the triumph of justice and righteousness. I have no fellowship with such sympathy. Nor have I any charity for the pretended patriotism of those, who sympathyse with tyrants only.

And it is also equally remarkable, that this kind of sympathysers never see any danger, in continued slavery. They always feel easy and secure on this point. But it is a manifest truth which many of them must know, that slavery is fraught with dangers of every description.— Not only is it highly dangerous to the morals, the piety, the wealth and liberties of a country, but to its strength and integrity. Slavery cripples every nation that tolerates it, and weakens its power of resistance against invasion. For this reason it proved the ruin, of the Roman Empire and many other countries. It has often appeared wonderful to me, that this danger was not better understood in this country. Never was there a truer maxim, than that 'a house divided against itself cannot stand'; as all history testifies. Now that Great Britain has abolished her own slavery, ours is to us the more dangerous. And for military reasons, which all who have any correct knowledge of the military art can appreciate, should another war break out between this country and Great Britain, or any other nation equally powerful, the result can hardly fail to be disastrous to us. The best military policy calls loudly, for the abolition of slavery in the United States. Great and imminent also is the danger of slavery, to our remaining liberties; as the political aspect of the present crisis demonstrates. Freedom of speech and of the press, are the fundamental supports of all other rights. Suppress these, and our liberties are gone forever. On the subjects of slavery and abolition, they are now suppressed in the slave states; and we may judge of the danger to which they are exposed in the free states, from the unceasing efforts made to destroy them there; with so much apathy and little opposition to those efforts, from a corrupted slavish public sentiment. The crisis has now arrived in which it is clear, that all the people of this country must be freemen, or else all slaves. The spirit of slavery will permit no medium or compromise. The preservation of northern liberty therefore, demands the total extinction of southern slavery.

And supposing there were some real danger in abolition; what I ask is the amount of this danger, in comparison of that of continued slavery? Such continuance will not only destroy new and increasing generations of black victims, but white ones also. The present horrid outrages on the rights of freemen in this country, forewarn us of this inevitable result. The threatenings of God forewarn us of the same catastrophe. Colour is no barrier to slavery; as European experience proves. Nor ought it to be any barrier to emancipation. Slavery never remains stationary, any more than other national vices. If long persevered in, it enslaves the whole laboring population.

And the longer abolition is delayed, the greater will be the difficulties and dangers attending its accomplishment, on account of the increased numbers of masters and slaves, and of the servile habits of the free states. These difficulties are less now than they will be at any time hereafter; and this fact should stimulate every lover of righteousness and his country, to persevere in his exertions, until the mighty work is accomplished. That the dangers of slavery are very great and are rapidly increasing, is admitted by all. All are agreed on this point. But how easy is the remedy for them! Simple voluntary abolition, with scarcely any perceptible trouble, expence or danger attending it, and with every good effect in certain prospect, both to the slaves and masters and to the whole country, is all that is necessary! Let us all hasten to ef-

fact it then, in the shortest period possible, 'working for that purpose while the day lasts,' with the fullest confidence in the promises of God, that it will work every blessing and no evil.

5th Obj.—*Abuse of Rights.*

It has been gravely argued or rather pretended, that were the slaves to be restored to their rights, they would be liable to *abuse* them in various ways; just as if the apprehended misconduct of others, will justify us in depriving them of all their rights. This is the spirit of the old federal objection to universal suffrage, and the extension of equal rights to all. And the same pretence is now urged in Europe, against universal suffrage, and what are called *popular* rights. How often was it formerly asserted in the northern states, as it is by the slaveholders now, that universal suffrage would ruin the country if tolerated, *because*, poor men destitute of property would abuse the privilege. But the absurdity of this phantom has been demonstrated, as often as the right of suffrage has been extended. The same objection is raised by aristocrats all over the world, against the extension of equal rights. And yet of all men aristocrats are the most liable and ready, to abuse rights of every description. They are more wealthy, learned, skillful, powerful and unprincipled than the rest of mankind; and they abuse all their rights proportionally. Slaveholders form the worst aristocracy in the world; and from them we have nothing to expect, but constant abuses of rights. But we have no reason to expect intentional abuses of rights, from people like our slaves; who least of all men are able and willing to abuse them. Corrupted as they are by the vices and tyranny of the whites, they are comparatively honest, when contrasted with their masters, overseers and other white neighbors. They seldom commit crimes except from necessity; while their masters are in the habit of committing them, from wantonness, caprice, avarice, malice and revenge. From whom then ought we most to apprehend abuses of rights; from the slaveholders who have been educated in such abuses; or from the poor slaves who have never had any rights to abuse? If any body ought to be enslaved on account of liability to abuse rights, it is certainly the slaveholders; who of all men are the most liable to such abuse; as their infringements and perversions of the British West India apprenticeship act, and their habitual enormities under the cloak of law and custom prove. And least of all men, ought we to fear dangerous abuses from poor slaves, who have always been obliged to make the most prudent and innocent use, of their few poor privileges, if any they have had that deserve to be called such. The danger of abuse of rights to any dangerous extent, from former slaves in a state of freedom, is a mere bug bear.

It is often said, that the coloured people must be made, to keep 'their proper places' in society; and that if they are allowed equal rights, they will become insolent, ungovernable and abusive; the meaning of which is, that these people must be enslaved, so as to occupy the station in society, assigned them by slaveholders and others; and not the station which God and nature have assigned them; that is, an equality with the whites in abilities and rights. Every person's 'proper place' in society, is what the just and equal laws of God, not the unjust and unequal laws of men, have assigned him. God has created no aristocratic or slavish distinctions in society. They are all artificial wicked inventions of men. Kings were granted to men as a punishment and curse to them; (vide 1 Sam. viii 5—22); and they have generally proved themselves to be such. The truth is, equal rights are *natural* to mankind, as the equality of their natural abilities and wants proves; and the inequalities made in the distribution of those rights, are preserved by unnatural and criminal means; which cause all the pretended 'insolence' apprehended or complained of. It is the abuses of rights offered *to*, not *from* the coloured people, that provoke all the resistance and cause all the disturbance with them. The same kind of disturbance is apprehended by the aristocrats of Europe, as what is likely to annoy them sorely; and deeply do they regret the progress of their subjects in that knowledge, which produces the necessity of their submission to so many 'reforms,' alias innovations on their standing abuses of rights. The outcry of their brethren on this side the water arises from the same cause. It is the loss of their unjust power to abuse the rights of coloured people they fear.—They dread the restraints that equal rights will impose on their aristocratic insolence, caprice and pride. They dread the loss of the unjust and criminal 'gains of oppression.' And this is all they fear. For the total loss of justice, virtue and happiness produced by *slavery*, they have no fears nor regrets at all!

But if coloured people are so very *inferior* as is pretended, what reason have the whites to fear their abuses of rights? Nobody ever fears that very weak simple people, will ever abuse rights to any dangerous extent. History informs us, that we never need fear great abuses from *them*; whatever we may from others. Nor do men ever fear such abuses from *brutes*. These two pretences are irreconcilable; of course, one or the other must be false. The dilemma they present is this. If the coloured people have equal abilities, Divine justice demands for them equal rights; if they have not, there is no danger of their abusing these rights to any dangerous extent, even if they do have them.

[illegible] certainly do, as universal experience proves. Not a person living can honestly plead not guilty. The Scriptures declare us to be as 'prone to sin as the sparks that fly upwards'; and we all know by bitter experience, that this doctrine is strictly true. The Laws of Nature and Revelation alike proclaim the humiliating fact. According to the spirit of the objection then, all mankind ought to be enslaved and wholly deprived of all rights, for fear they may abuse them. But in such case, where will they find MASTERS! The objection thus appears a contemptible absurdity; and is in reality a most contemptible objection. The truth is, no man ought to be called to account in this world, for the abuse of rights, unless he thereby injures the rights of others; or in other words, except for crimes and civil injuries. And for the redress or prevention of these, the same just and equal laws are as sufficient to restrain one man as another; the colored man as the white; and all men alike. Such laws are made for this purpose and this only. Nor is any thing more necessary for the protection of rights, or the prevention of their abuse, in the ordinary course of society, than the operation of such laws. It is the equal rights themselves the alarmists fear; and not their abuse.

It is frequently said with some plausibility, by the advocates of gradual abolition, that the slaves are too ignorant to make a *proper use* of equal rights, were they to possess them. This is a great mistake. The instinctive knowledge, as well as the possession of their natural rights, is created in all men by their Maker; so that they instinctively know when they violate or abuse them, and when they are violated or abused by others. Education is not necessary to enable mankind, to understand the nature of Rights and their Abuses; however much it may qualify them to vindicate the one or reform the other. The most ignorant of mankind, such as heathens or savages, instinctively know them both. A man who cannot read or write, will as certainly know when his natural rights are violated, as a Grotius or Puffendorf, or any other great master of law; and though he cannot make the technical distinctions as well, he will as quickly resent such violations as others. It is a fixed rule of the Law of Nature that mankind should thus clearly understand their own rights and wrongs, which proves the natural existence, inheritance and inalienability of the former. And, like that of Revelation, it thus demands the immediate restoration of their rights to slaves; teaching in the same manner, the capacity of all men to understand rights and wrongs; and thereby proclaiming their moral accountability.—Reason was given to men to understand right and wrong; and Scripture and nature both prove this capacity. Every person however ignorant he may be in other respects, instinctively knows when he wrongs his neighbor; and feels guilty accordingly. This is so well understood, that many, perhaps the majority, contend, that 'conscience is an innate principle.' This is the reason why the Scriptures hold all men however ignorant, under condemnation for sin. The Common Law also recognizes the principle, when it holds all persons within its jurisdiction, liable for the breach of its rules; agreeably to the maxim, 'ignorance of the law excuseth nobody.' Nature has thus prepared men for the enjoyment of those rights which God demands for them.

This instinctive knowledge is the reason, why there has been so much contention between civilized people and savages; the latter having generally been the injured party. Though the savages have had no literature or learning, yet they have readily felt the numerous infringements of their natural rights, by their unprincipled visitors; and have resented them with the only means they had, open force and violence. It is also the reason why slavery is so very dangerous; and why though every man is prepared for instant liberty, he never is nor can be 'prepared' for slavery. Every slave knows perfectly well, that his natural rights are wrongfully violated and outraged, and waits for nothing but a favorable opportunity to assert them by force.—Of this slaveholders are perfectly aware, and are prepared accordingly. And though whole generations of slaves pine and die in despair of justice, yet the nature and reason of their successors is not altered, and the same danger still increasing yet continues; so that in the end freedom must come; and either with or without retribution, according as abolition is forced or voluntary. Emancipation may be delayed by wicked means, but they can never prevent its final accomplishment. God having prepared men for liberty, has also prepared the means for its attainment; which will finally triumph over all obstacles.

As to the possession and use of the *republican* rights so called, (such as suffrage, offices, &c.) by colored people, no reason can be rendered against it, but what an honest person will be ashamed of. If their ignorance be objected to, it is enough to say, that our slaves are as well qualified to make a proper use of them, as a large portion of their white countrymen; and they are less likely intentionally to abuse them, than any other portion of the community. It is no more justly objectionable, to extend these rights to *them*, than to poor illiterate whites. The objection was never valid any where, except in the mouths of aristocrats; whose interest and inclination it ever has been, to monopolize all political power, in order to oppress the multitude, for the sake of enriching and aggrandizing themselves. All men have sufficient natural sense and understanding, to comprehend the most useful political measures; and the poorer they are, the more likely are they to adopt honest measures. If any body of men ought to be deprived of political power, it is the rich and not the poor; for the [illegible] powerful though without politi-

[illegible] the deprivation of the republican, but the *absolute* rights of the slaves, that is so much complained of, namely, their Security, Liberty and Property. The republican rights being as was observed in the First Lecture, necessary for the protection of these, are therefore the rights of coloured as well as other people; but if the absolute rights be restored to those people, their condition will be tolerable compared with what it now is, without the possession of all the minor rights.

I will conclude my remarks on this objection, by observing, that I do not recollect ever to have heard it raised, by any person who seemed to fear, that *slaveholders* would ever abuse rights, or use them improperly. I have also heard those talk about the *insolence* of coloured people, who are always silent about the habitual insolence, cruelty, and other vicious and dangerous habits of slaveholders. I have no charity for the honesty or republicanism of those who 'strain at a gnat and swallow a camel' in this way.

6th Obj.—*Pauperism and Vagrancy.*

I never yet heard this objection raised, by any body that manifested the least sympathy or pity, for the *actual* pauperism, degradation, hardships, miseries and sufferings of the poor slaves, in their present hopeless condition; nor for what they might suffer under any circumstances, until their *liberty* and rights were talked of! The miserable condition of the slaves in a state of *bondage*, never made any impression on their humane feelings. But all at once, as soon as abolition began to be seriously discussed, their sensitive feelings were roused; their 'milk of human kindness' began to overflow, and they became suddenly impressed with fears, that the poor slaves would come to *want* and *poverty*! Such disgusting hypocrisy is only fitted to inspire honest minds, with sentiments of detestation and contempt of the objectors.

To talk of the apprehended want and poverty of *slaves* indeed! As if the poor creatures *could be* reduced to *more* poverty, want and misery, in a state of freedom, than they already experience in a state of slavery. Yet disgusting as this pretence is and stale as it has become, and contradicted as it has been by every case of emancipation, there are yet some few ignorant or wicked enough, occasionally to bring it forward. Let us therefore examine its merits, or rather demerits.

A great lamentation has been raised upon the strength of the pretence, that the slaves if emancipated *cannot support themselves.* When perhaps some of the newspapers employed to circulate the alarm, contain advertisements of 'lots of slaves,' to be sold at auction or otherwise, and describing the victims as 'likely,' 'healthy,' 'strong, active and smart,' 'very ingenious, capable, honest, intelligent,' &c. '*first rate* field hands, cooks, house servants, coachmen, *mechanics*, such as tailors, blacksmiths, carpenters, masons, &c. gardeners, *engineers*,' &c.; and frequently as 'moral,' 'sober,' 'steady,' and even 'pious and religious' persons. Whoever before heard of the 'inability' of persons of this description, to 'support themselves' in a state of freedom and equal rights; especially in a country like this, where 'first rate,' healthy, likely, skilful, intelligent, honest and religious, labourers are so scarce, as to command high wages in comparison of those of other countries? The high prices of slaves also proves, that their wages must be high after emancipation. And this too notwithstanding it is generally estimated, that the labor of one freeman is worth at least that of two slaves to the employer. As they are, the slaves *do* support both themselves and their masters, and in some cases yield great profits to their owners. In a state of freedom they will easily do the same; to the great advantage of both parties. The senseless cry of 'what shall we do with them?' is also raised, when the slaveholders cannot do *without* them, bond or free, a day. Their steady employment in either condition, is a matter of absolute necessity, both to them and the whites. Both will come to want and starvation unless they are thus employed. The absurdity of the objection renders it harmless.

The truth is, if we judge from experience and analogy, our slaves introduced to a state of freedom would of all mankind [illegible]

count of *their inveterate habits*. They cannot be 'worse off' than they now are; so that if their condition alters at all, it can hardly fail to become better. *Their inveterate and forced habits*, are those of the greatest industry, temperance and frugality; or rather of drudgery, abstinence and parsimony; and we well know, that people possessing these habits, are least of all liable to come to abject and squalid want, unless forced to it by oppression. If others come to want they do not. Of all people, we know they are the most apt to accumulate property and improve their condition; and the history of every case of emancipation, proves the truth of the doctrine. Emancipated coloured slaves have uniformly improved their condition, in proportion to the degree of freedom they have enjoyed, as much as any white people have; a fact that proves freedom to be necessary and good for all; it having uniformly improved the condition of mankind. There is not one slave in a thousand but who is better able, to get a good living and be useful in a state of freedom, than the average of white laborers. Still more; there is not one in a thousand, but who can get a better living for himself without property, than the majority of the whites can for themselves with it. This will at first view appear wonderful; but a little reflection will soon satisfy every one of its truth. All the *habits* of the slaves give them this superior ability. It is a remarkable fact, that oppressed, degraded and abused, as the free coloured people falsely so called have been, there has always been less pauperism among them in proportion to their numbers, than among the white population. It has been a rare thing to hear of a colored pauper. They have done as well for themselves as could be expected of any people, placed under like discouraging circumstances. So far as experience teaches, there is not the slightest reason to apprehend *pauperism*, among our colored population, in a state of republican freedom. It is an evil the least to be dreaded of any.

As to *want of employment* in such a condition, it is to those who view things in the light of experience and sober reason, a false pretence on the face of it. For so necessary is the steady employment of the colored people at the south, in their present condition, that the prices of slaves are high, and their employment is so profitable to their owners, that considerable numbers are killed off annually, by excessive hard labor and want of food. After emancipation also as well as before, colored labor will meet with no competition at the south; white laborers not being able to endure the hot climate of those regions. After emancipation, there will be the same need of colored laborers, and even a greater want of them, than before. For as free labor is cheaper to the employer than slave labor, as all economical writers agree, the profits of southern agriculture will be increased, and the stimulus of fair wages will insure a greater amount of labor, than that of the whip. Such has at least hitherto been the uniform result of emancipation. In Antigua the slaves were all freed at once, and put on a level with their masters, in one day. In less than a week they were all employed at fair wages. Not the slightest disturbance or convulsion, or scarce any inconvenience followed. And the general prosperity of the island has in all respects, been far greater than it was before.

Impoverishment of the *slaveholders* is also another objection, raised by persons who never cared a straw for the poverty and misery of slaves. Sympathy for tyrants is a crime, and as such ought to be detested. And were the objection as true as it is false, we ought nevertheless, to urge the justice and righteousness of immediate emancipation, without regard to apprehended losses, of unjust tyrannical gains. Tyranny is a worse crime than treason; and those who sympathise with tyrants, are worse than those who pity traitors. 'Treason against tyrants,' said a great man, (Patrick Henry, a slaveholder,) 'is obedience to God.' And he might have properly added, so is all manner of righteous opposition to their tyranny.

But *it is not true*, that the practice of righteousness is unprofitable and ruinous. There is hardly a slaveholder in existence, who is also a landholder, (and most slaveholders are landholders,) but who will increase his property and income by abolition. And abolition is the best possible policy for all slaveholders, who desire to accumulate the greatest possible quantity of property. They cannot increase their property so fast or so much, by any other means. By abolition they will to be sure, lose their property in human bodies and souls; but they will gain a much greater amount in value otherwise. They will gain it in the increase

of present profits; they will gain it by saving the losses and expenses of slavery; but above all, they will gain it in the rise of the value of their real estates, as the certain result of abolition. Judging from West India experience, within ten years from the time emancipation takes place in this country, that increase will be much greater, than the value of all the slaves emancipated, great as that may be. They will also gain that which is of much more importance than wealth, namely, exemption from the dangers with which they are now surrounded, which though daily increasing they cannot avert; and a peace of enlightened consciences they cannot now enjoy. The increase of gain to the slaveholders from abolition, will be very great in every way—vide Ps. xxxvii 16, Prov. xv 16, 1st Tim. iv 8, vi 6, Heb. xiii 5. It is civil freedom that gives to property its greatest value. As a matter of sound policy, therefore, independently of justice, it is every way the duty and interest of slaveholders, to abolish slavery. According to recent authentic accounts, the planters in the British West India islands all now admit, that the twenty millions pounds bonus they received, is equivalent to a free gift; such has been the rise in the value of their real estates, during the period that has elapsed since their abolition. A similar result will follow emancipation here; because like causes always produce like effects.

Of similar futility and falsity, are the pretences of *vagrancy, idleness* and *crime*, set up against abolition, by persons who never had any apprehensions of the actual vagrancy, idleness and criminality of slaveholders; though these are habitually idle, criminal, capricious and cruel. They are also accustomed to travel, ride and 'roam' about the country, indulging in all manner of dissipation, extravagance and criminal excess, and rioting upon the 'gains of oppression.' And yet their apologists and admirers in the free states, manifest no alarm at such conduct; but express the greatest apprehensions, lest the industrious and frugal slaves, may possibly contract habits of idleness and vagrancy! Their virtuous fears are, not that those who are already dissipated should remain so, but that those who are not may become so!—When and where and by whom, was such tender concern for the morals and welfare of slaves ever manifested, as to wish them to remain in slavery to preserve both! Admirable means indeed for such a benevolent object. Nor do these patriotic alarmists manifest the least anxiety, at the wandering habits of a great many people at the north, travelling about 'loose,' and 'roaming' from place to place, as suits their inclination and interest; many of whom are far more idle, dishonest and depraved, than any of the slaves are. The hypocrisy of these scandalous alarmists has become so disgusting, as to defeat their object. Their prognostications are now generally treated as idle tales.

One class of people need special reproof, for their participation in these criminal pretences. A great many professing christians seem perfectly content, with the indefinite continuance of slavery; through fears that the negroes if freed, will come among them. But what sort of christians must these be, who are willing that slaves should remain in interminable bondage, deprived of all rights, comfort and hope, both now and hereafter, merely that their own tastes may not be offended! What rational hope can such persons have of salvation?—vide Matt. xxv 45, 1st John ii 9, 11, iii 14, 15, 17, and many other similar passages. What are we to believe of the religion or final fate of those, who habitually neglect the plainest commands of scripture, such as those in Prov. xxxi 8, 9, &c., on such pretences as the foregoing? Will God accept them as excuses for such neglect? Nay verily; they will only increase the condemnation of those who use them.

Wherever just and equal laws prevail, there is no danger of idleness and vagrancy. The cause of these evils in despotic countries, is not on account of climate and want of natural advantages, as some ignorantly suppose; but wholly on account of unjust, oppressive laws and customs. Wherever men's just rights are carefully protected by law, they will always be industrious and virtuous; and the countries governed by such laws will be rich, prosperous and powerful. Let emancipated slaves have the benefit and protection of good laws, and their industry and good conduct will be insured. Nothing but good laws are needed to produce this happy effect, after any case of emancipation.

So also the scandalous charges of '*nuisances*,' '*incubuses*, and '*blights on our industry*,' made

by the Colonization Society and other corruptionists, against the free blacks as well as the slaves, are now generally treated, as reckless and contemptible falsehoods. The falsity of these base charges has been so glaring as to defeat their object. Common sense taught every body, that the real 'nuisances' in any society, are those who like our slaveholders, spend more than they earn, by living in an idle, luxurious and wasteful manner; and that in truth the slaveholders and other aristocrats, are the greatest 'nuisances' 'incubuses and 'blights,' in the world; and least of all such, are the industrious and frugal poor, whether enslaved or not. It is not those who earn or produce all, but those who spend without producing any thing, that are the true 'nusiances.' What would be thought of the republicanism or moral honesty of a man, who should deliberately declare' that all the neighboring population, the operatives and producers of the northern states, were 'nuisances' and drones? Or who should call the northern farmers, mechanics and manufacturers, 'incubuses' and 'blights on our industry?' He would be of course' contemned nnd despised as a base liar. And so injustice and truth ought every one to be despised, who applies the same false and degrading epithets, to our industrious colored population. They have done more than any other class of persons, to feed and clothe and enrich the nation; and will continue to do so bond or free. But as if it were not sufficient abuse to enslave them, they must be further insulted by these base charges! These charges first promulgated by the Colonization Society, were too gross and offensive for our intelligent population to swallow; and they have not therefore been lately repeated by that Society. They are of no use at the present time, but to serve the purposes of inferior, retail slanderers.

The same pretence of 'inability to take care of themselves in a state of freedom,' was raised by the British government against the colonies, previous to the revolutionary war. It is the standing protence raised by all aristocrats, against popular government and equal rights. That government kindly undertook, to legislate the Colonies out of their freedom, because 'they did not know how to use it.' Since its independence however, the country has in general, very easily governed itself. The only serious internal political troubles it has ever had, originated with its slavery; and this accursed cause is the only serious evil, that now disturbs its harmony. Any state can easily govern itself well, if it be free from slavery and slavish laws and customs.

But to come more closely to the point. There is nothing in the habits of our slaves, no peculiarity in the nature of colored people, to warrant any just apprehensions of their vagrancy, idleness and criminality, in the enjoyment of freedom and equal rights. Negroes in their savage state as in Africa, have stationary habits, are always whether civilized or not, strongly attached to the places of their nativity, and are as susceptible of the influences of civilization, as the white race. They are remarkable for their fidelity and gratitude when well treated.—Those of them who have 'roamed' to the north, into a climate uncongenial to their constitutions, were driven thither by the grievous oppressions of the south; and were the yoke of bondage to be removed from the southern negroes, there is more probability of those at the north emigrating to the south, than of the reverse. Their labor will find no competition in the south; then why should they go to the north, where they will be sure to encounter it? It is reasonable to suppose, that all reasonable beings left to their own free agency, will be operated upon by reasonable motives. And when all the reasonable motives that can induce men to promote their own interest, conspire to urge our coloured population to the south, as they all will after emancipation, it is reasonable to conclude that most of those now at the north, will then remove thither. They certainly will not lack for employment there. The steady employment of the coloured people at the south, is not a matter of choice; but of absolute necessity. In a state of equal freedom and rights, the whites being unaccustomed to labor, and unable to endure the heat of the climate, must employ the blacks or starve. They will have no choice of laborers; for they cannot procure a substitute for black labor. White hands cannot long endure field labor in hot climates. Why then should the blacks go to the north to compete with white labor; while by remaining at the south they can avoid it? They never will be simple enough in a state of freedom to do so. The blacks will be the best, and indeed the only laborers the planters can procure, and they would be sure to give them the prefer

ance, even if they had a choice. Were all the slaves to be emancipated in one day, they would be sure of being hired the next day, or the next week at the farthest; so indispensable is their steady employment to the white population. No other laborers would even in case of competition, stand half so good a chance for employment and wages; for no others are half as skilful. The knowledge and skill of the slaves is confined within a narrow compass; but in the agricultural pursuits of the south, it is accurately perfect; and the more so, as it is almost the only skill in the arts they possess. No other laborers can at all compare with them in point of skill, in this most important department of industry. It is a curious fact, that although the same alarms of 'idleness,' 'vagrancy' &c., were raised in the British islands, previous to their emancipation, they have since actually passed laws in some of the islands, to prevent the emigration of their free black laborers, to other places where there is a greater demand for labor. They are extremely unwilling, to part with *their* 'nuisances,' 'idlers' and 'blights on their industry'! The negroes it appears wish to go to Demerara, not for the purposes of 'vagrancy,' 'roaming about in idleness' and committing crimes, but to get the high wages offered in that fine country. But the islands cannot spare them, and so they must be kept at home. 'Nuisances' indeed; when their services are so necessary they cannot be spared! Emancipation will produce the same effect in this country. The demand for free black labor will be greater than the supply; and many of those same colonizationists, who now pretend to be so eager to get rid of those 'nuisances,' the free blacks, will then be as anxious to retain them in the country.

And here I ought to notice the blasphemous pretence, of the *necessity* of legislating against free coloured people in the free states, as against foreigners and criminals: and also the law rendering citizenship dependant on *colour!* It is said in defence of this infamous legislation, that the free blacks in the free states are *injurious* to the slave states; or as the real meaning is, injurious to the practice of slavery. And thus out of comity and respect to tyrants and for the protection of crime, innocent people must be legislated out of their rights, and persecuted if possible out of the country, by *republican* legislators! The competition of their labor with that of the northern whites, is also set up as an apology for such wickedness; by men who are well aware, that the monopoly of slave labor impoverishes the poor southern whites; and who must also know, that such legislation only tends, to perpetuate slavery and its evils. On their own showing, this pretended 'necessity' for such legislation, is produced only by slavery; and the legislation is only intended to support the abomination. It is said also by way of excuse or apology, that the free states entertain *just fears*, of the free blacks within their borders. Fears of what? That their free blacks will conquer or jeopardize, twenty or thirty times their number of whites! Can this be the meaning of these alleged fears'? One can hardly believe it; though those who raise the pretence are the very persons, who charge the abolitionists with cowardice! No, this is not what is meant by these 'fears' of the north; or rather that portion of it, which forges and legislates upon the pretence. Their real fears are, that the northern free blacks will 'injure' southern slavery. And so rights must be trampled on, and justice outraged, and God's providence blasphemed, to prevent this effect. Native free born Americans not even suspected of crime, are deprived of citizenship and other rights, on account of *colour* it is said; but more truly on account of slavery. The *morality* of such legislation is, that because slaveholders abuse the colored people, therefore others ought to do the same; they are under the *necessity* of doing so!

It is sometimes pretended, that this kind of legislation is 'necessary,' on account of the *disaffection* of the free blacks, towards their native country. Suppose this false pretence true; what I ask is it that creates this disaffection, but this very legislation? What prevents the blacks from loving their country as well as others, but the wrongs the country is constantly heaping upon them? And what is so well calculated to increase this alleged disaffection, as the increase of these wrongs? What man can, nay what man *ought*, to love a country, which renders him and his whole race outlaws without crime! Surely the colored people need to be all real christians, to 'love' such a country! The 'republican' policy of the country is, to render all the coloured people as disaffected as possible, by the severest oppression, and then because they *are* disaffected, to oppress them if possible still harder; insult being thus added to injury and crime made to justify crime. This is the morality of American republicanism!

It has often been falsely alleged, that the slaves if freed, will be 'unable to support themselves' and will be 'unable to take care of themselves' in a state of freedom. To rebut this calumnious pretence, I ask, when and where *have not* the free coloured people 'supported themselves'? — Who has 'taken care of' and 'supported' them, if they have not? Nay, who have supported the country if they have not? Notwithstanding all the disadvantages, under which they have hitherto lived and labored, let those who advocate the pretence, point to *one* case if they

can, where any considerable number of them ever came to want, for lack of skilful industry on their part. Do not the 15,000 free negroes in Canada 'take care of themselves'? Who has 'supported' the free black population of St. Domingo, South America and the British West Indies? Or if the pretence be true, why colonize free blacks in Liberia to starve and perish? Or will transportation to a barbarous coast, increase their ability to 'support themselves'? If free negroes can 'support themselves' any where, it is in this country; and if they fail here, it is ridiculous to send them elsewhere for that purpose. It may seem like folly to show the falsity of so absurd a pretence; but let the following facts prove it. Instances of pauperism among free blacks have always been extremely rare. Wherever they have had any thing like a fair chance for a decent livelihood, they have improved it faithfully. Even where they have had no such chance, (and they rarely ever had any); where they have been cheated, defrauded, swindled and otherwise abused, as they usually have been, they have generally preserved themselves from pauperism by honest means. Many slaves have purchased their own freedom, by savings obtained from extraordinary exertions, over and above their customary labor. Many free blacks have purchased the freedom of their relatives, with the proceeds of their labor, besides 'supporting themselves;' toiling years for this pious purpose. And their has been a smaller proportion of rogues and criminals among our free blacks, than could reasonably have been expected, considering the uniformly vicious and unprincipled treatment they have received. They are as fond of gain as other people; and fully as willing as others to labor honestly for it; as their general conduct has always testified. And if many of them have been convicted of crimes; what is it but white treatment, white example and white legislation, that have corrupted them? And is it not ridiculous to pretend, that people who have shown such ability in a state of oppressive degradation, will in a state of freedom and equal rights, be *unable* or *less* able, to support themselves, and be as useful as before? The only people that will ever need 'taking care of,' either before or after emancipation, are the white and not the black people.

So of the stale pretence, that 'negroes will not work unless they are enslaved.' And this cry is raised at a time when it is well known, that our commerce with St. Domingo has for more than twenty years, been greater than with almost any other foreign country, except France and England. Or as before asked, if the pretence be true, why send American negroes to Liberia to starve? Will their natures be changed by transportation? As before remarked, it is not colour or climate or other natural causes, but bad laws and customs, that render men and countries idle, shiftless and poor. The Haytians have their just rights protected by law; and are of course as industrious and as prosperous, as any other nation. So too of the hypocritical cant of 'what will become of the poor creatures if they are set free,' and 'how shall they be disposed of &c.,' raised by persons who never cared, what became of slaves in a state of slavery; and who would be much better employed in making such inquiries as the following: What will become of the *country*, if the slaves are *not* set free? What right have we to 'dispose of' people at all or to seek to dispose of them, without their request and without crime in them? What authority have we from the Scriptures, or from natural justice, to make laws with reference to colour, or other physical peculiarities in the human species? What genuine republicanism is there, in outlawing or disfranchising innocent people, in their own native country? What genuine democracy is there, in depriving one sixth part of our population of all their rights, without crime or just provocation in them? What impoverishes and degrades the poorer class of whites in the slave states? What renders those states, as states, so very poor, and weak and defenceless against foreign invasion; for every one of the slave states is in proportion to size, poorer than the poorest of the free states? What is it that impoverishes their soil, retards their manufactures, commerce and public improvements, and corrupts and reduces their whole population, &c. &c.? These and similar inquiries, have a *practical* application and tendency, and are highly interesting and important; but the fear of pauperism among emancipated slaves, is one of the last scarecrows, that even hypocrites will set up against abolition.

It has frequently been feared, that immediate emancipation would produce some great *convulsion* or disruption in society, in some way and degree or other. So *great* a change must it is argued, necessarily have this effect. That the change from slavery to freedom is very great is admitted. But the alarmists should remember, that it is always a *peaceful* change. The reasons why it is and must be so, have already been stated; to wit, that God himself has promised it shall be peaceful. It is *impossible* that any bad effect should follow. All the effects will be only good, (and of course peaceful and agreeable), to all parties concerned. No special legislation or other precautions will ever be necessary, to prevent anticipated bad effects; because no such effects can possibly follow. Let the good laws and customs of the country remain, to operate upon the whole population alike, without regard to colour or other circumstances, and they will be amply sufficient to regulate and govern the country happily, without the aid of any special means adapted to the emergency.

I have often thought these pretences were raised, only by those who were afraid, that the slaveholders might not be able to live in idleness and luxury, if their slaves were to become freemen. These alarmists ought however to dismiss their fears. It is possible that some of the slaveholders may be compelled by emancipation, to exert more industry than they have hereto-

fore done. If this is to be regretted, the slavists may raise their notes again. Since however it has been shown, that most of their protegees will *gain* greatly by abolition, we may conclude their fears to be false ones.

7th Obj.—*Compensation.*

Let us first examine the *morality* of this objection. It is contended, that the slaveholders in case of emancipation, ought to be *compensated* for their loss of property in slaves. Now if this 'compensation' be *just*, it ought to be made; if *unjust*, it ought not to be made, though individual slaveholders really do suffer loss. In the solution of this proposition, rest the whole merits of the objection.

What is Justice? It is rendering to every man his honest and fair dues, whether of reward or punishment. Such is the rule of the Law of God, and such the dictate of common sense. We all understand this to be the true definition of Justice. Justice is a virtue sternly enjoined in the Scriptures, both by precept and example; as the passages quoted in the First Lecture will show. The effect of it is declared to be happy; vide Ps. xxxvii 37, cxii, 6–8, Prov. x 6, 7, Eze. xviii 5–9, Amos v 24, 1st Pet. iii 10–12, &c. The Scriptures abound with examples illustrating the happy consequences, of the practice of this great virtue; and of the certain ruin attending that of the opposing vice of Injustice: as already sufficiently explained. The law of Nature discovered from uniform experience, proclaims the same doctrine. Now there is no justice nor righteousness nor honesty in slavery; for if there were it is no crime: nor would it be denounced as a sin of the first magnitude in the Bible. The practice of it is dishonest; and all the gains made by it are dishonest gains; as much and even more so, than the gains of the common thief and robber. The slaveholders then agreeably to the objection, ought to be compensated, for parting with criminal ownership, and relinquishing the means of dishonest gains — When it can be proved that the murderer, the perjurer, the forger, the counterfeiter and the common thief and robber, ought to be compensated, for abstaining from the commission of their crimes, and thereby relinquishing the means of their dishonest and criminal gains, it must be honestly admitted to be right and just, to compensate guilty 'menstealers'; but not before. For my own part, I would as soon compensate a pirate as a slaveholder. Piracy is at present more discreditable than slavery to be sure; because it is not legalized, and because there are fewer pirates than menstealers; and thus is all the essential difference between the two crimes, except that slavery is the greatest. Pretty morality, truly!

Nothing can be truer, than the total want of all justice in this kind of compensation. In plain justice, the compensation should come *from*, not *to* the guilty slaveholder. He should pay the innocent victims of his barbarous oppressions, the wages he has robbed them of, and damages for the stripes and other cruelties he has inflicted on them. He has no *just* claim whatever, to compensation for property he never *justly* owned, and the ownership of which was a continual crime of the first magnitude. Nor does it make any difference, that laws made in derogation and contempt of the laws of God, permitted him to hold this property. Such laws are only an aggravation of the sin of slaveholding; because community or union in crime, only increases its guilt and enormity. Retribution instead of compensation, is the *just* doom of the slaveholder. In every other case, where a person parts with stolen or robbed property, we never imagine him to deserve *pay;* but always *punishment* for his crimes. He himself never thinks of compensation in such a case; *because it is unjust,* and he knows it. And the injustice is as much greater and more glaring in the case of slaveholders, as the crime of slaveholding is greater than that of common robbery. A few and but a few of the slaveholders may suffer loss by abolition; and if the rest who are to gain by the measure, were to make up the loss, upon the principle of 'honor among thieves,' it might be no more than right. But excepting this case and mode, compensation in or by any other, would be as unjust as slavery is.

Perfect justice is not an arbitrary, mutable principle, varying with the ignorant prejudices, corrupt hearts and tyrannical interests of wicked men; but is a sure emanation from the incorruptible throne of the Almighty. Many men are too depraved, to discover its nature and application clearly; or too selfish and wicked to practice it, if they did. But this does not alter its nature or essence; nor lessen their obligation to obey its dictates. It is the same immutable thing every where at all times and places; and it is so plain and obvious withal, that those are wholly without excuse, who neglect or refuse to understand and obey it. Even the most guilty persons know more about it, than they have honesty to confess. The most unprincipled slaveholders well know, that they have no *just* right to compensation; because there is no merit in guilt and crime to deserve it. The rules of Divine justice are clearly detailed in the Bible; and these as clearly forbid compensation. Instant abolition is commanded without reference to it. The Bible denounces *punishment* for crimes unrepented of; but never reward for their cessation. It promises *forgiveness* on condition of repentance and reformation; but never compensation for those acts. What would be thought of the morality or policy of a law, that should offer rewards and exemption from punishment, to common thieves, robbers and pirates, on condition of re-

ioring their plunder? Yet these criminals are far less guilty than slaveholders. The stealing of men (Gen. xl 15, Ex. xxi 16, 1st Tim. i 10), like the stealing of things, consists in taking and holding them as property, without the consent of the owners and without any equivalent; and the former crime is as much greater than the latter, as men are more valuable than things. And such a law would only encourage the commission of those crimes, by recognizing the right of property obtained by them, and by offering compensation or bounties on its restoration. That must be an unjust and impolitic rule, that whould *hire* men to abstain from sin. Such a rule could never be an emanation from the Almighty. And that man who with the rules of the Bible in his hands, can insist on compensation to former slaveholders, cannot be much under the influence of christian principles.

Were not the white people of this country so dreadfully corrupted by slavery, they would readily see and acknowledge, that nobody *deserved* compensation but the slaves. If a white person is abused or treated with the least degree of slavish oppression, every body perceives intuitively, that the injured person alone deserves satisfaction; and is entitled to demand it by law. And they also perceive as distinctly, that nobody ought to *make* the satisfaction, but the persons who have committed the injury. Who is ever foolish enough to dream in such cases, that the *aggressor* instead of the injured party, is justly entitled to satisfaction or compensation!—Precisely similar is the compensation slave question; varied perhaps by one circumstance.—The whole country, free states and all, are alike guilty of the oppressions of the coloured people. The free states have in a variety of ways, constantly aided, abetted and protected, the slave states in their oppressions. They are all joint transgressors; and ought to make joint restitution; not to the slaveholders; but to the victims of their joint oppressions, *the slaves*.—This is what justice and equity require. This is what the Law of God & the common law both require; as the numerous authorities already quoted clearly show. This rule is so plain and indeed self evident to uncorrupted minds, that no arguments can make it plainer. There would be great justice in giving the surplus monies in the U. S. treasury to the slaves; but none at all in giving it to the slaveholders. There is every kind of justice and righteousness, in making compensation to injured slaves; but none at all in making it to their owners.—Compensation to guilty menstealers, would be the height of injustice and unrighteousness. It is simply compensation for crime; and would operate as a bounty on it.

But the compensation question, so far as the pecuniary interests of the slaveholders are concerned, is wholly unnecessary and unealled for. For if as has been shown, the slaveholders will gain more than they will lose by abolition, they will not need compensation any more than they deserve it. Abolition being a privilege to them, they ought to give instead of receiving compensation for it. According to all the premises in the case, compensation to slaveholders is as unjust and unnecessary, and therefore as unreasonable, as slavery itself is.

Private gain is certainly a very base motive, to induce men to practice righteousness. They ought to be thus induced, by the pure and noble motive of love of duty. But it is nevertheless well to have it understood, *how* 'justice is the highest expediency.' The abolition of slavery would produce an extraordinary flow of financial prosperity, all over the country. Not only the southern but the northern states, would soon feel the reviving effects of this flow.—The southern demand for northern goods and products, would be more than doubled. The cities of Boston, New York and Philadelphia, would gain a great accession to their trade.—And thousands of the mobites who are now so eager to prevent abolition, will then regret their folly, in attempting to delay a measure, fraught with such signal advantages.

8th Obj.—*Interference.*

A great outcry has been raised against the abolitionists, for their *interference* with what their enemies say is 'none of their business.' Nothing has been more common than this vile clamour; the insinuation being always, that the 'interference' of the abolitionists with slavery, was an *illegal* or at least an 'improper' interference. When pressed to explain and offer reasons, *why* this interference is wrong, most objectors will admit that it is legal; but oppose it on the score of impropriety or inexpediency. The truth is, both slavery and the measures pursued to abolish it, are perfectly legal in this country; but being moral antagonists, if both

operate freely together, one or the other must soon fall. Thus the friends of slavery well know; and pursue their measures accordingly. Their great object is, to stop all anti slavery organization, discussion or other action. But in pursuing this object, they are compelled to adopt measures, that are always sinful and often illegal. For, as was remarked in the First Lecture, 'crime can only be supported by crime.'

There is at least a want of reciprocity in the pretence; for, according to the settled custom of the country, the northern states and people, always have and yet do make it their 'business,' to *support* slavery in various ways. They have in the spirit of criminal comity, enacted unconstitutional and oppressive laws, for the apprehension and delivery of fugitive slaves, and many of them have voluntarily assisted in this iniquitous 'business.' And in the same criminal spirit, most of the free states have enacted various other oppressive laws against coloured people, to abuse and degrade them for the sake of slavery. And those unfortunate people have for the same wicked reason, been constantly abused by the corrupt sentiment of these wicked states. Much persecution of the abolitionists, by mobs and otherwise, has also prevailed in those states. Yet the cry is raised, that 'the north does not support slavery,' and has 'no business with it.' It is only when the northern people *oppose* slavery, that its friends discover it to be 'none of their business!'

Complaints have also been raised against the abolitionists, for 'interfering' in what are called, the *domestic* concerns of the slaveholders. But slavery is *not* a 'domestic' concern, any more than murder or other crimes are. The power which it confers is nothing similar, to the natural authority of a parent over his children; but is exactly that of the usurped authority of any other criminal or tyrant over his victims. And, if 'interference' in any case of tyranny or crime can ever be justified, it is justifiable in the case of American slavery. No point of morality or good policy was ever plainer than this is. The spirit of the objection is also false. Any lawful and moral 'interference' with the 'domestic relations' of others, is always right and proper. Such interference is the constant practice of every neighborhood. Christ and his apostles 'interfered' with those relations, by giving directions for their proper exercise.

Though the slaveholders affect to be highly indignant, at all 'interference' with their 'peculiar institutions'; yet they themselves have in years past, united with the rest of their countrymen, in 'interfering' with the 'peculiar institutions' of Algiers, and some of the other Barbary states; apparently without imagining there was any thing 'improper' in it. They have also most indignantly 'interfered,' with certain 'peculiar institutions' existing in Greece and Poland. And what may seem singular, they were the very same kind of 'peculiar institutions' with their own, namely—slavery. The slaveholders ought certainly to 'cast the beam out of their own eyes,' before they blame the abolitionists. They now know how to pity the Turks and Algerines!

It will be obvious to reflecting minds, that there are *two kinds* of 'business' in which men engage; the one is, exercising our own just rights in a just and proper manner; the other, usurping and trampling on the just rights of others. The former kind of 'business' is followed by the abolitionists; the latter by the slaveholders and their supporters. So there are two kinds of 'interference' in any matter; namely, a legal and illegal, just and unjust, or right and wrong interference. Also, there are two kinds of 'liberty' in the world; the one kind is, the using of our own just rights in a right and proper manner, for the benefit of mankind; the other, that of abusing our just rights or using wrongs, to the injury of others. The first kind of liberty is used by the abolitionists; the latter by their enemies.

And the pretence that the abolitionists are exercising an *improper* 'interference' with slavery; what is it but plain blasphemy? Think, for instance, of its connexion with the following plain christian duties. Obeying the commands of God, 'none of their business!' 'Pleading the cause of the poor and needy,' 'opening their mouths for the dumb,' and 'for those that have no helper,' 'none of their business!' Imitating the example of our Saviour and his followers, 'none of their business!' Endeavoring to promote righteousness and justice, by just, lawful and peaceable means, 'none of their business!' Attempting to send the gospel to the poor and to the heathen in our own land, and to break every yoke and set all the oppressed

free,' by just, righteous, peaceable and christian means, 'none of their business!' Laboring in the spirit of the gospel, to bring the nation to repentance and reformation, from its greatest sin, and thus to save itself from destruction, 'none of their business!' With such horrid impiety is this pretence fraught. To say that *such* works are 'none of the business' of the abolitionists, as all who assert this pretence in effect do, when God says they *are* the 'business' of every body, is open blasphemy.

Slavery is not mentioned *by name*, in the constitution of the United States at all; nor has that instrument any but *constructive* allusions to it. It is silent in direct support of the abomination. It neither allows nor forbids the practice, any more than it does Christianity, Free Masonry, Banking, Insurance, Lotteries, Common Schools, Sectarianism, and a thousand other important matters, which it leaves wholly untouched. Slavery like those other matters, is, therefore, a *state* or individual right, reserved to the states where it prevails by custom, in the general reservation clause of the constitution, (vide Amendments, Art. 10,) and is wholly under their *legal* control. They only have the *legal right* to abolish it by *law*.

But slavery, like christianity, free masonry, and all other reserved state rights and institutions, or any other rights and institutions whatever, is under the *moral* control of the whole world. All men have a *legal* right to criticise and approve or condemn, the institutions, laws and customs, of any country in the world, whether they be legal or not; and if those institutions be wrong and sinful, they are under a *Divine obligation*, to attack and abolish them, by just and legal means. Every man has a right derived from his Maker, (not from human constitutions,) to examine and criticise any institution, or other subject he pleases, whether it be legal or not; and if he knows it to be wrong and sinful, if he knows it to exist in violation of the Law of God, he not only has the Divine right, but it is his *duty* imposed by his Creator, (1st Thess. v 21,) to condemn and denounce it, and endeavor to abolish it; whether it be legalized by the laws of men or not. The Almighty has made it his imperative 'business' to attempt to abolish it. If a right or practice of any description be *unjust*, all men have the Divine right and duty both, to 'interfere with,' attack and overthrow it, by just and legal means. All freemen are in the constant habit of so doing; and the only reason why slaves dare not, is because they are not free; and when men have lost the legal right thus to criticise, approve or condemn, they are already enslaved. The most fatal step to the destruction of liberty, is the suppression of this right of examination. Every thing that God has condemned, man ought to condemn, whether it be constitutional or not; for although we may not possess the legal right of repeal, we always have that of exposure; and may lawfully terminate any evil custom or practice, by rendering it odious and unpopular. It is on this ground, that the late attacks on Free Masonry were justified. Free Masonry is as constitutional and legal as slavery is; and in the same sense; being a reserved right. Both practises have been legalized by long custom, and are thus reserved customary rights; and neither ought to be attacked and destroyed, unless they are wrong. And if they *are* wrong, every man in society, has a legal right and Divine duty both, to destroy them by legal and christian means. The same remarks apply to the case of christianity. Infidels are in the habit of justifying their attacks on the christian religion, by asserting that it is a false religion and ought to be attacked; and it is well understood and admitted, that they have a perfect legal right to do so. They never think of attacking it, because it is *illegal* or unconstitutional; or because their means and mode of attack are otherwise. Whether any institution or custom ought to be attacked and destroyed, by moral means or not, depends entirely on the simple fact of whether it is wrong or not; and not at all on its constitutionality or legality. For every thing that is right ought to be protected and preserved, (1st Thess. v 21;) and every thing that is wrong ought to be abandoned and destroyed, by just and legal means, without regard to its constitutional and legal qualities. For otherwise the laws of men may *justly* be made, to supersede the Law of God!

It is on these principles, that the modern abolitionists have so fiercely attacked slavery.—The enquiry with them has not been, whether slavery was legal or not; for that nobody contends about; but whether it is *just* and right or not; not whether it was consistent with the

wicked laws and customs of men; but with the just and holy Laws of God. They say, that although slavery is legal, yet it is the worst institution in the world, and ought therefore to be 'interfered with,' and overthrown and destroyed by moral means; as many other wicked customs have been before. In conducting their attacks on the abomination, however, they have ever confined them, strictly within the limits of the laws of the land. They have never gone the length the apostles and martyrs did; who frequently *broke* the laws of the land, to attack heathen customs. They have never given their enemies the opportunity to prosecute them for breaches of those laws, or in other words, they have never used any but lawful means to extirpate slavery. And so well has this fact been understood, that their enemies have been under the necessity, of breaking the constitutions and laws of the country themselves, in numerous infamous instances, to oppose and suppress abolition measures and action;—but utterly in vain. The enemies of abolition have throughout all the slave states, utterly prohibited and suppressed, constitutional freedom of speech and of the press, on the subjects of slavery and abolition—and have endeavored to produce the same effect in the free states, by unconstitutional and criminal means. All the *unconstitutional, illegal* and unjust proceedings, that have occurred in the United States, in reference to slavery and its proposed abolition, have been committed by the slaveholders and their supporters; while so strictly constitutional and legal, have been all the acts of the abolitionists, that their enemies in despair of legal means of resistance, have applied to various legislatures in the free states, to enact unconstitutional laws for the express purpose, of rendering the means of abolition criminal. They have never been able to sustain a single prosecution against the abolitionists; simply because the latter as such, have never broken the laws. The objection goes therefore only to the means used *against* abolition—not to those in its favor.

It is utterly impossible for Congress or any State Legislature, to enact a constitutional law, to abridge or in the least impair, full freedom of speech, of the press or of the mail, on the subjects of slavery and abolition. When the constitution guaranteed freedom of the press, (Amendments, Art. 1), it impliedly granted and guaranteed *all the means necessary*, to the perfect enjoyment of this right. This it does by what is called, *necessary* implication. When an *express* power is granted by any written or printed instrument, all other powers *necessary* to the full exercise of the express power, are also granted; because without them the grant would be imperfect, or nugatory and useless. This is a well settled rule of law. All the sophistical ingenuity that slavery could muster, has been exhausted in congress to prove the contrary; but in vain. The mail being absolutely necessary, to the full enjoyment of the right of the press, is therefore a constitutional institution, exclusive of positive provisions, (vide Art. 1, Sec. 8); and to plunder or otherwise violate or restrict it, is a violation of the constitution. The same remarks apply to post offices and their facilities. Nor can any restriction or check be lawfully given, to the freest exercise of those rights, except in cases of their abuse; which is legally construed to mean, the use of them for the breach of other constitutional laws and customs. If the laws against treason for instance, are violated by means of the press or the mail, the violators may be punished by legal means; or if possible by such means, they may be prevented beforehand from the violation. But none but constitutional means can be legally used, to procure such punishment or prevention; and these means are, application to constitutional courts of law, and constitutional process issued in due course of law. All other means used for that purpose, are violations of the constitution of the United States, destructive to liberty and ruinous to the country.

And the pretended *abuses* of constitutional liberty by the abolitionists: what are they? Obedience to the commands of God, an *abuse* of such liberty! Imitating the perfect example of our Saviour, an *abuse* of our just rights! Inveighing against Human Oppression in a just and legal manner, an *abuse* of the freedom of speech! Proclaiming the whole gospel, by speaking, writing and printing against slavery, an *abuse* of freedom of speech and the press! 'Doing as we would be done by,' 'remembering those in bonds as bound with them,' and practically 'loving our neighbor as ourselves,' *abuses* of our Divine and constitutional rights! Attempts in the spirit of the gospel, to reform our own country from its greatest national sin, and thus avert from it the wrath of Heaven, an *abuse* of any description! &c. To call those acts *abuses*, which God Himself has commanded all men to perform unceasingly, is most daring blasphemy, such as none but the daring sin of slavery, could render men wicked enough to utter.

The abolitionists as such, have never violated any constitutional law of the United States, or of any individual state. All slave laws are in one sense constitutional, that are not forbidden by the constitution; that is, they do not expressly violate the letter of that instrument, (though they all do its spirit); and are in this negative sense, sometimes called constitutional. But even in this sense, the abolitionists have violated none of them. They have in effect, simply requested

the slaveholders, to 'interfere with' and annul those laws themselves; giving their reasons for the request. Besides, mere criticism and condemnation of a law or custom, is no breach or infringement of it. It does not impair their legal effect or binding authority at all. Nor is it any violation of a person's rights, to request him to dispense with their exercise. The right remains in as full force after the request, as before. If for instance, a man obtains an unjust judgment against his neighbor, I do not violate or impair his legal right to collect that judgment, by entreating him to remit it. In such a case, I merely exercise a right of my own, without disturbing his rights. I may 'disturb' his *conscience* by my advice; but certainly not his rights. And if in consequence, they are relinquished at all, the relinquishment will be his act and not mine Every man has a legal right to abolish his own unjust rights himself; and others have a legal right to advise him to abolish them. So to advise or entreat a person, to quit drinking ardent spirits, or chewing tobacco, or abandon any other bad habit, or to criticise and condemn his habits, and reproach or ridicule him for them, does not violate his legal right, to use those articles or pursue those habits. The exercise of the right of petition, remonstrance, entreaty, rebuke, advice, ridicule, reproach or warning, is never an 'illegal interference' with the rights of others. The just and legal exercise of our own rights, can never produce such an effect. It is not because abolitionists violate slave rights, but because they disturb slave consciences, by the righteous exercise of their own rights, that their enemies are offended with them.

And *to whom* are abolitionists or others justly responsible, for real abuses of freedom of speech and of the press and other republican rights? To the *mob?* To Lynch men and Lynch laws? To persons acting without or contrary to law? This can hardly be, even in cases of real abuse; for there is no warrant for such liability, either in the Law of God or in the just laws of men — By such laws, *ex post facto* liability is not tolerated; and least of all such liability to *mobs;* even though they form the majority. One reason is, that it leads directly to despotism; the bulk of mankind preferring the tyranny of a single despot, to that of the licentious and unprincipled mob. There is but a single step, from the tyranny of a mob of any description, to that of a single despot; as all authentic history shows. It is useless to pretend that *mobs* will not abuse power worse than others. No others are half so liable to abuse it. Mobs are at least always ignorant and phrenzied; and most of them reckless and unprincipled. One of their objects always being to violate existing laws, it would be a wonder indeed, if they ever administered real justice.— Acting at once as judges, juries and executioners, they seldom pay any more regard to real justice than savages. People subjected to their outrages without other redress, will readily submit to despotism to be rid of them; despotism being always preferable to anarchy; no tyranny being so intolerable as that of the mob. In truth, no *ex post facto* liabilities ought ever to be tolerated for a moment; on account of their imminent danger to public liberty and safety. This is the reason why such liabilities are strictly forbidden by the common law. And the only human liability for all human abuses or offences, should be to constitutional, just and impartial laws, administered by courts of the same description; all existing *before* the offences did. Any other liability or administration of justice, is sure to prove the certain destruction of just liberty and rights.

The avowed object of all the pro-slavery mobs and other criminal proceedings, is to prohibit and wholly suppress all investigation of the merits of slavery and its abolition—directly contrary to the express precepts of Scripture,—vide Prov. i 2–6, ii 2–5, iv 5–7, 1st Thess. v 21, and a thousand other similar passages. The freest examination and discussion of all subjects whatever, are the plain spirit of the whole Scriptures. They are expressly commanded by the Almighty in every part of His Word—and the curiosity in man and the spirit of enquiry, which God has framed in the Law of Nature, as well as the necessity of a correct knowledge of all subjects, for man's best welfare, prove that they are rules of that Law also. The moral as well as legal guilt, of anti-abolition mobs and other crimes, is therefore manifestly of the blackest kind—and if not speedily repented of and reformed from in this country, will provoke the Divine if not human retribution against it. Nobody guilty of such crimes, ought to hope to escape Divine vengeance, even in this world.

Another strange circumstance attending the present anti-slavery struggle is, the support so many *poor* people in the free states give to slavery. This suicidal conduct is the result of the deepest ignorance and moral corruption—such as nothing but the spirit of slavery could produce. Nothing can exceed the contempt, which all slaveholders have for the *poor*, whether white or black, bond or free. They are the worst enemies the poor have—their chief employment being to 'grind their faces,' and enslave them all so far as they can. Such is the nature of aristocracy every where—and for the poor to *support* it any where, is treason to their own rights and happiness. They impair their own liberties by such misguided conduct, exactly in proportion as they sustain slavery by it.

Great pains have been taken to apologize for slaveholding outrages on the constitution, on the plea of the 'inflammatory tendency' as it is called, of the abolition publications. Self preservation it is said, is the *first* law of nature, paramount to all constitutions; which said 'self preservation' always means with the apologists, the preservation of slavery. The same kind of apology is set up in Europe, for the censorship of the press and standing armies. 'The self preservation' of monarchy, aristocracy, monopolies and other tyranny, is made to be paramount in European countries, as that of slavery is in this country, to the Law of God and the equal rights of men; and the same doctrine is for the sake of slavery and its horrors, now attempted to be introduced here. This must be the meaning of this kind of 'self preservation;' for if it were not, the slaveholders would not fail to put a stop to this 'inflammatory tendency,' by the sure and simple remedy, of immediate abolition. Nothing can be easier, than to prevent any pretended tendency of abolition publications, than the practice of abolition righteousness. Let slavery be abolished and just and equal laws established, and all the inflammatory and incendiary publications in the world, will produce no effect in community; because the fuel for them to burn will then be removed. They will have no more influence than Munchausen tales. This fact shows, that slavery is the only *guilty* cause, of the dangers of slavery. An institution that will not bear to have the truth told respecting it, without creating corrupt disturbance, must of course be a bad and criminal institution Good institutions always court examination; for the more they are examined, the less is there likely to be disturbance about them,—vide John iii 21. The bad ones only will not bear examination—vide John iii 19, 20. Slavery has been considered a prohibited subject for this reason. So from the instinct, of the 'self preservation' of Roman Catholic superstitions, the pope and his followers endeavored to prohibit the circulation of Luther's 'incendiary' books, and to destroy protestantism by massacre; and a similar reason now prompts both them and the slaveholders, to prohibit the circulation of the Bible among the slaves. The Bible is by far the most 'incendiary' book in the world to tyranny; and wherever it is fully circulated and well studied and understood, it will put an end to human oppression. Slaveholders dread it more than all the other anti-slavery publications put together; and because they could not wholly prohibit its circulation, they have perverted its true meaning, for the justification of slavery.

And supposing the 'inflammatory tendency' of abolition principles and publications, be calculated to consume slavery; is not this tendency *good*? And if so, why resist and endeavor to suppress it by criminal means? for the command (1st Thess. v 21,) is otherwise. Ought not slavery to be consumed by good 'tendencies' or other good means? Or, supposing the slaveholders are compelled by this 'tendency,' to consume slavery themselves for the sake of their own safety; will not this be *right*? Surely if the effect of this tendency be only to destroy slavery, it must be a good agent; and no one ought to oppose its operation. If the effect of any 'tendency' is good and only good, it must be highly sinful to oppose it. Let those who oppose abolition 'tendencies,' then, take heed lest they oppose God—vide Acts v 38, 39.

Great numbers of persons are opposed to the abolition project, because it produces so much *excitement;* just as if moral corruption could be attacked without producing excitement in it. Christ foretold this effect to his followers; and the prediction was fully verified by their subsequent experience; as it has been by that of every moral reformation since. Rage is commonly the first fruit of conviction. And however wicked such unjustifiable excitement may be, the guilt of it attaches to the corruptionists excited. Moral corruption is the cause, and proclamation of the truth the *occasion* only of its exhibition. The *morality* of the objection is, that we should never attempt to expose error and crime, because the exposure will meet *opposition!* No moral and political reforms ought ever to be attempted, lest they should be attended with *disturbance!* Where would have been our liberties, had this doctrine prevailed in the revolutionary war? Where would christianity have been, had it prevailed in the apostles' time? Nay, what would have become of liberty either spiritual or temporal, had it always prevailed? Or if the doctrine be true, why did Christ and the prophets, apostles and martyrs all disregard it in practice? Nay, why has God himself issued contrary commands?—vide Jer. i 17–19, Eze. ii 3–7, iii 7–11, Matt. x 16–28, &c. And what kind of Christians are these

who urge *such* objections, against the proclamation of righteousness and the exposure of sin; and what kind of fate have they reason to fear?—vide Amos vi 1-11, Luke vi 24-26, and many other passages.

For the support of slavery, the old aristocratic common law rule is brought forward, that 'the greater the truth the greater the libel;' as applicable to the promulgation of abolition doctrines. And this doctrine so contradictory to all republican principles, is now openly advocated by men, who formerly professed to reject it with abhorrence. That the truth is very dangerous to *slavery* or other aristocracy, monopoly and other tyranny, there is no doubt; and we cannot therefore wonder that this anti-christian rule, (vide 1st Thess. v 21,) should be invented by aristocrats and other corruptionists, and advocated by slaveholders and their tools. But it is to be hoped, that this tyrannical maxim, will not gain final allowance in this country; for if it do, *in respect of the right of investigating and censuring public acts and institutions*, the liberties of this country are gone forever. When men lose the right of complaining of bad conduct and institutions, they lose the last protection of their freedom.

But the 'inflammatory tendency' of anti-slavery publications, *on slaves*, is denied; whatever may be their effect on slaveholders; which is not doubted to be highly 'inflammatory.' Notwithstanding the uproar to the contrary, these publications are eminently peaceful; and tend strongly to preserve the peace of the country among the slaves. They expressly deny all right of resort to physical force, for the abolition of slavery; asserting the right of political, moral and religious force alone for that purpose. And if the slaves are ever informed to the contrary, it must be by their masters and not the abolitionists. Slaves are constantly 'excited' by the operation of slavery; but never by that of abolition; for the latter is the only sedative that will affect them. It is a *false charge*, that anti-slavery publications tend to excite slaves to rebellion; for their effect is directly the other way; on account of the peaceful doctrines they teach. That slaves have the right of rebellion by the *Law of Nations*, (vide Vattel. 40-47, 243, 244, 631, 623,) there is no doubt. They have the same right to rebel against oppression, that our revolutionary ancestors had; and that the Greeks, the Poles, the Haytians, the Irish, and all other oppressed people have. Nor can they commit treason by such rebellion. For being deprived of all rights, and receiving no protection from their country, they owe it no allegiance, any more than cattle and horses do; the duty of allegiance depending wholly on the right and benefit of protection—vide 1st Blac. Com. 48, 123, 366-372. But the abolitionists utterly deny all such right of rebellion, by the *Law of God*; which Law they declare to be paramount to all other laws; and as such, primarily obligatory upon slaves, as well as others. The abolitionists have attacked slavery; not the public peace and welfare; for these they have endeavored to promote, in the best possible manner, and by the use of the best possible means, namely, those which God himself has commanded. They have attacked slavery, in the same way the Bible, the common law, the declaration of independence, the writings of Sidney, Paine, Jefferson, Henry and O'Connell, and every speech and essay against tyranny and in favor of liberty attack it, namely, by political, moral and religious arguments and denunciation, as a *sin*, or crime against the Law of God and all just laws of men. Nobody can be better satisfied of the sinfulness of slavery, by professed anti-slavery publications, than he can be by these writings. Nor is there the least danger of insurrection among the slaves, from any of these publications; for none of them teach or recommend it; but the contrary.—There may be some danger of rebellion and treason from the slaveholders; *provided they can obtain sufficient northern assistance*. And this is all the danger of the kind, attending the abolition controversy.

But if this 'inflammatory' pretence be true, what becomes of the pretence, (as remarked in the First Lecture,) of the alleged *happiness* and *contentment* of the slaves; those joyous creatures who it is asserted, are 'the happiest peasantry in the world,' and 'who would not take their freedom as a gift, if it were offered to them?' Is this effect credible on *such* beings? And if the slaves really are 'better off' than the northern laborers, why do not such publications have this 'tendency' on those laborers? And if 'the laboring classes of the north are as much oppressed as the southern slaves,' why do not the slaveholders in retaliation, scatter 'inflammatory cir-

culars' among them? Do not similar causes *always* produce similar effects? Will such circulars produce less effect on oppressed whites, than on oppressed blacks? Why do not the slaveholders then, fight the abolitionists with their own weapons, and revenge themselves in this effectual way? Have they not yet received sufficient provocation for it? Or are they too virtuous to meditate or practice revenge? These are serious enquiries, to those who make the foregoing pretences; and it behooves them so long as they persist in the pretences, to render satisfactory answers to these questions.

The cry of the slaveholders is, 'let us alone;' as that of the devil was to our Saviour—vide Mark i 24, Luke iv 34. 'Hands off' from slavery is their demand; as if such was their right and the duty of others; notwithstanding God has commanded otherwise. It always was the desire of tyrants and other criminals, to be 'let alone' in their crimes—and they dread and hate all 'interference' with them. The Pope, the Russian, Turkish and other arbitrary governments, and all other oppressors, have demanded silence and non-interference, with their 'peculiar' institutions, policy and measures. Their principle is, that none but *themselves* have a right to 'intermeddle,' either with their own institutions or those of others, however much others may be interested in or affected by them. So easy and natural is it, when we have obtained one degree of unjust power, to arrogate still more; and so necessarily does the practice of one crime, lead to that of others. The right of 'interfering' with other mens' rights, conduct, or pretensions, depends wholly on their justice or injustice. If any right or assumption be *unjust*, it is our Divine right and duty both, to 'interfere' with it to its destruction.—And when the outcry against 'interference' is raised, we should remember, that none are so apt to raise it, as those whose conduct will not bear investigation—this being the only reason why it is raised. For if investigation could be endured, it would be invited instead of avoided—and the policy is to raise the outcry, in order to prevent investigation.

The monarchists and aristocrats of Europe, have the same reason to complain, of republican books and circulars, that the slaveholders have of anti-slavery publications—for the effect of both is to abolish tyranny. Let the slaveholders and their friends act consistently then, first 'casting the beam out of their own eyes'—and not arrogate to themselves privileges, they deny to their European brethren. Let them before they complain of abolitionists, first endeavor to suppress all republican institutions and publications, and abolish republican principles entirely; on account of their 'inflammatory tendency,' to disturb the peace of tyranny in the old countries! Let them as consistent moralists and politicians, carry out their principles in practice, to their full extent. A partial application of these principles, will be apt to leave their 'chivalrous honor,' obnoxious to the charge of insincerity. In such case, a great many consequential people, and especially their European friends and sympathysers, will be apt to suspect them of unworthy selfishness!

The *propriety*, good policy and expediency of anti slavery efforts, depend, as already remerked, entirely on the justice or injustice of slavery. But this injustice having been clearly demonstrated, it as clearly follows from the premises, that it is not more a legal right than it is the imperative moral and religious duty, of abolitionists and other persons, to repeat and increase their righteous attacks on the abomination, and persevere in them, so long as a vestige of it remains—vide Ps. xcvi 10, Amos v 15, Rom. xii 9, 2d Tim. ii 19, and a multitude of similar passages. The spirit of the whole Bible is imperative on all mankind, to rise up against the abomination; and the neglect to do so is a very great sin of omission. It is a *wilful*, presumptious sin; because every person with the Bible in his hands, must or might know that such was his duty. The spirit of the common law too, commands all persons within its jurisdiction, to attack slavery. For it is a rule of that law, (vide 1st Chit. C. L. 3. 4,) that every person knowing of the commission of a crime, is bound to prosecute it to punishment. There is not a just code of laws on earth, but whose spirit calls for resistance to slavery; because *justice* demands such resistance. No point of moral, religious or just duty can be plainer than this is.

It is sometimes said, that the slaveholders are the *best judges* of slavery and its proposed abolition; and that both subjects ought therefore, to be left entirely to their discretion. In the

sense that criminals know the most about their own crimes, it is admitted, that the slaveholders know the most about slavery; but that either have the best *moral sense*, of the criminality and evil tendency of their sins, is denied. It is their superior knowledge, that renders them the more criminal and deserving of punishment. Yet according to the spirit of the pretence, this very knowledge is the reason why, all criminals ought to have the sole cognizance and disposition of their own crimes! But the pretence is false. The sick are *not* the 'best judges' of diseases and their remedies. The corrupt are *not* the 'best judges' of moral and political corruption, its effects, consequences and remedies. For if they were, drunkards would be the best preachers against intemperance, whoremongers against lewdness, and heathens against idol worship and other heathen abominations. There would be the same propriety, in leaving the sick to heal themselves, as to leave slaveholders to abolish slavery alone. The slaveholders themselves know better, when they always send *christian* missionaries, to convert heathen nations; vide Rom. x 14, 15, Tit. i 3. Moral like physical diseases left to their own cure, will seldom be cured; but almost always destroy their victims. It is the express ordinance of God, that the righteous should always be sent, to 'call sinners to repentance'; vide Matt. xxviii 19, 20, Luke xxiv 47, and many other passages. The prophets and apostles were sent and the christian ministry ordained, to fulfil this ordinance; and every Divine mission recorded in the Scriptures, was of such men for such purposes; and this is the only object of the present christian ministry. This ordinance thus corresponds with the providence of God, as exhibited in the nature of sin and its remedies; or in other words, with the Law of Nature. This is so plain, that in all other cases, nobody expects a general reformation from great and customary sins, without preaching from those, who are not infected with such sins. Nor have we any more reason to suppose, that the slaveholders will repent of the sin of slavery, without such preaching, than that the heathen will without it. They have been 'let alone' long enough already, to convince every honest person of *this* fact at least.

A great outcry has been raised about *foreign* 'interference' with American slavery; just as if the commands of God were not binding on foreigners, when out of their native countries; and as if they had no right to 'interfere' with American slavery in any way. But this is not true. It is the Divine right and duty both, of every person in the world, to 'interfere with' slavery, *any where and every where*; and assist to abolish it, by legal and christian means.—This is the spirit of the whole Scriptures. The apostles were all 'foreigners' out of Judea.—But the command to them was, to 'teach ALL nations'; vide Matt. xxviii 19; and of course, to 'interfere with' their corrupt institutions, customs and religions, to their entire abolition and destruction, by all just, legal and christian means. 'Foreign interference' with sin is thus a Divine ordinance; and to oppose it is of course blasphemous. And the Law of Nature so plainly teaches the same rule, that in other cases, the slaveholders as readily practice on it as others; as for instance, in sending 'foreign' missionaries to the heathen. They also employ 'foreign interference' to *support* slavery, by sending out 'foreigners' to kidnap innocent people, for that purpose. No persons in fact exercise more 'foreign interference,' than slaveholders themselves; and it is only when it disturbs *them*, that they discover its impropriety! So the American slaveholders and others, are in the habit of procuring 'foreign interference,' in all their affairs both public and private. They have employed foreigners as officers and soldiers, as diplomatists and legislators, and in every other capacity and business. It seems to be the 'foreign interference' with *slavery* only, that is illegal or improper in this country; except when used for its support. Every *other* kind of such 'interference,' with American institutions and affairs, is perfectly right and proper!

And how do these uproarous complaints, of the slaveholders and their allies, correspond with the oft repeated taunt, that the efforts of the abolitionists, produce '*no effect*' at the south? They first complain bitterly *of* the 'effect;' and then declare that no effect at all is or can be produced! But if this be true, why all this uproar? Why all the mobs, Lynch law, vigilance committees, breaches of the constitution, and other crimes? It would seem as if no pretences could be used, to support slavery or oppose its abolition, but what contradicted each other. The truth is, the pretence of '*no effect*' is a simple falsehood. Every day's news de-

clerez, that a most powerful anti-slavery effect, is produced all over the south, by the vigorous and untiring anti-slavery efforts, daily made and constantly increasing. The gospel weapon, 'sharper than a two edged sword,' is carrying all before it. May its use prosper, to the speedy overthrow of American slavery.

I ought to observe in conclusion, that the objection of 'interference' is constantly and only made, so far as my observation extends, by persons who never manifest any alarm or indignation, at the reckless violations by the slaveholders and their supporters, of the Law of God, the constitution of the United States, and the just laws of the land. To *this* kind of 'interference' they raise no objections. Nay, great numbers of them secretly approbate the horrors of Lynch law, and other violations of the constitution, and peruse with satisfaction and delight, the accounts of the barbarous outrages on the persons, the property and the rights of the abolitionists; and of the pretended success of the spread of slavery and slavish doctrines. And these sentiments they denominate republicanism!

9th Obj.—*Constitutional Compromises and Guarantees.*

There is no stronger sign of national degeneracy, than a general disposition, to *respect* wicked laws, customs and institutions, vide Prov. xxviii 4, Matt. xv 1–9, Mark vii 7, 8, and other passages. It was this kind of respect that induced the Almighty, to destroy so many ancient nations, by His judgments. A general disposition to support legalized crimes, or sins authorized by law or custom, is one of the surest signs of approaching national ruin. Such a state of public sentiment, manifests a corrupt love of sin, and hostility to salutary reforms; and unless it be itself reformed, the total destruction of civil liberty, is sure finally to follow. A wicked law or custom is as much to be abhorred and opposed, as a wicked act, sentiment or principle. And those who do not abhor and oppose the one as well as the other, are unfit for rational liberty; and are in the greatest danger in the end, of becoming the willing subjects of absolute despotism. The general prevalence of this corrupt sentiment is, according to the spirit of the Scriptures, the surest harbinger of national destruction; as is exemplified, by the *natural* effects of such a sentiment on society, or, by the Law of Nature. Need I add, that this very sentiment prevails most extensively, throughout this union? The frequency with which the objection now under consideration is made, proves the fact clearly; just as if wicked constitutions and laws of *men*, can justify sin; or as if any number of wrongs added together, can make one right!

Let us first inspect the *morality* of this objection. It bears, that the constitution of the United States was ratified, on a *compromise* among the several states, that it should *guarantee* the existence and support of slavery; that is, that it should guarantee a great, customary sin; and therefore, all moral and religious efforts to destroy the abomination, though ever so just and legal, must violate the spirit and reason if not the express words of that instrument; and are therefore *unjust* and improper. Not only the express provisions of the constitution say the objectors, but its whole spirit and meaning are sacred; and it is therefore highly improper, indecorous and anti-republican, to meddle with slavery at all; except to support it. The same reasoning will protect legalized murder and other crimes every where. It will justify every heathen custom or tyranical usurpation in the world! Fine morality for *christians* to adopt!

Stripped of all sophistry and unnecessary verbiage, the plain doctrine maintained by the objectors is, that the white people of this country, having leagued together by a solemn constitutional compact, to deprive the coloured people of all rights whatever, without crime in them or the apprehension of any, this compact as between the parties to it must be deemed *just* and sacred; and even the slaves are *morally* bound by it! That is to say, a compact among one class of human beings, to own and buy and sell and rob, starve, plunder, torture and murder another class of human beings, at their pleasure, without any provocation from the victims, is a *just* and *sacred* compact, *morally* obligatory both on the parties to it and on the slaves! A sort of mysterious holiness, like that attributed to the Inquisition, is on account of slavery, endeavored to be thrown round the constitution; which it is maintained protects the abomination. All corrupt agreements or unions in sin, are as was remarked in the First Lecture, void by the Law of God; and without any moral obligation. The same is the rule of the common law; all agreements *mala in se*, (that is, 'bad in themselves'), or, made to commit crimes, or whose considerations are criminal, being void by that law; vide 2 Blac. Com. 239. The *morality* of the doctrine therefore is, that a compact so corrupt, as to be void, both by the Law of God and the common law, is transformed by the constitution, into a just and righteous agreement! That where two parties make an agreement with each other, to rob, plunder, enslave or murder a third party, and without the least provocation from *him*, this agreement as between the parties to it, and its victims also, is *sacred* and *holy*; and ought by no means to be infringed either directly or indirectly! And *such* morality too! One of the greatest of sins against the Law of God, and pun-

ishable by that holy Law with *sure death*; a crime now declared by the general consent of civilized nations, to be *piracy* when committed on the high seas, *guaranteed* by the constitution of the United States! A *sacred* constitutional compact, to violate the Law of God and trample it under foot! The free states *confederate with* the slave states, in a solemn national compact, to support this violation! And yet we are constantly told, that the *northern* states do not support slavery; and have nothing to do with it or with its support; and ought not therefore to meddle with it! The objection goes the length of declaring in effect, that *human* constitutions and laws made in violation of the Law of God, are *sacred!* The consequence is, that the laws establishing the Inquisition, and forbidding people to 'search the Scriptures'; and in fact, all fundamental tyrannical laws, are *sacred* and *just* laws! And thus, if murder, theft, arson, perjury, counterfeiting, or any other crimes against God and His religion, can only be guaranteed by *human* constitutions, (as many of them have been), they instantly become *just and sacred rights*! The pretence does in effect, declare the constitution directly to support *piracy*; and indirectly to support its necessary appendages, murder, mayhem and every other crime! No American who regards the reputation of his country, will ever contend, for the constitutionality of its slavery. The country is sufficiently degraded, without the aid of this falsehood. The truth is, slavery is not a constitutional, but a *customary* right, in the United States. Like other wicked customs, it grew up by the force of corrupt circumstances, in defiance of the common law, on the credit of Scripture perversions; and is entitled to no more respect, than other customary sins. This objection and others that have been used to vindicate the practice of American slavery, have done more to degrade this nation, and to bring its boasted free institutions into contempt, than all other means put together. Meaner pretences cannot be set up, to support the institutions of Algiers. One of the American institutions is called '*peculiar*'; and its morality would seem to be 'peculiar' also. And unless it is abandoned, 'American morality' will become as celebrated, as 'Carthagenian faith.'

And *this* is the 'morality,' inculcated in free and republican America, as she is proudly called; a country in which there has been more boasting and swaggering and contending, about liberty and virtue and equal rights and democracy and republicanism, than perhaps in all the world besides! *This* is the morality, to be taught the American children and youth, and render them all good, virtuous, patriotic republicans! A morality, which teaches that one part of the human race have a *right* to confederate, to deprive the rest of all rights, without crime in them to deserve it! And that this 'right' is *just* and *sacred*! A morality which teaches in effect, that *piracy* is sacred, if constitutionally adopted, by a civilized, enlightened, christian nation! A morality that will justify, every tyrant and tyrannical government and laws that ever existed. A morality that will justify Robespierre and Danton. Why not; they being in possession of the supreme power of the state, their agreement to massacre must be *sacred*, on the principle of this kind of morality. It will justify Nicholas, Mahmoud, Louis Phillippe and all other tyrants; for all their oppressions are 'constitutional'; and of course 'sacred'! Beautiful morality this for *republicans* to inculcate!

But as we have already seen, the rule of the Law of God is, that Human Oppression is none the less wicked, because it is constitutional and legal. It is even more wicked; for community in crime only increases its guilt and enormity. It only increases the extent of the crime, and of course the extent of the guilt. Nothing can be more *immoral*, anti-republican and anti-christian, than this most blasphemous objection is.

Let us give a passing notice, to the morality of the pretence, that the people of the free states have *no right*, to discuss, criticise and denounce the practice of slavery; because as is pretended, the constitution gives to the slave states, the exclusive control of it. Strange pretence this; that in a country boasting of freedom of speech, as expressly guaranteed by the same instrument, the only matter respecting which the right of speech does *not* exist, is the right and practice of slavery! There are a thousand reserved rights besides slavery; and all are considered proper subjects of criticism, debate &c., except this one! *Sacred* right indeed!: But for the *morality* of the exception; which is, that if a crime equal to murder in enormity, is only protected by a *constitution*, it thenceforth becomes so sacred a right, that those who are not engaged in committing it, though ever so much interested in its operation, have no right even to discuss its merits!—And none but the criminals themselves, have a right to meddle with it; except to support it when necessary! And so if murder, piracy, forgery, counterfeiting &c. can only be shielded by a constitution, all examination of their nature, effects and tendency must be silenced! Hence no missionaries can lawfully declaim against heathen abominations, such as idol worship, parricide, infanticide &c., nor republicans against legalized despotism; for all such practises and tyranny are 'constitutional' where they prevail. Fine morality this for republicans!

The slaveholders demand the *exclusive* control, of the whole subjects of slavery and its abolition; not excepting even their morality; thus attempting as Mr. Blanchard truly observes, to make that a *local* question, which God has made universal; for God has commanded all men without distinction, to discuss, control and abolish it. The demand is therefore blasphemous. It arrogates a different disposition, of a great moral subject of the highest importance, from that which God has commanded to be made of it. The spirit of the demand is, that nobody ought to

have the control of crimes, except those who commit them! Nobody for instance but murderers, ought to have the control of murder, or thieves of theft! This is a fair specimen of slaveholding morality.

Having thus disposed of the morality of the objection, let us next examine its *truth*. I have already stated, that the constitution of the United States, does not guarantee the existence of slavery. It is entirely silent on that subject. It has however, several *constructive* provisions, which affect the operation and even the existence of slavery; though none of them guarantee either. It contains for instance a constructive guarantee, (Art. 4, Sec. 2), that so long as slavery *does* exist, runaway slaves escaping into the free states, shall not become free by the laws of those states; but the master may take and carry them back to slavery again. But this clause does not apply to the case of a slave, voluntarily taken by his master into a free state; as has recently been decided, in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Nor does this guarantee give either to Congress, or to the Legislatures of the free states, any right to make laws to arrest fugitive slaves, and thus aid masters in their recovery. The plain meaning of the guarantee, almost in words is, that those legislatures shall not make any laws, to *prevent* masters, from apprehending such runaways themselves; (a provision directly contrary to the spirit of the Law of God; vide Deut. xxiii 15, 16, Oba. 10-15; and a most heinous sin of omission). It gives them no authority to enact laws, to *assist* slaveholders or their agents, in this barbarous, piratical, anti-christian business. Nor does the guarantee give any authority to congress, to enact laws directing state officers in the free states, such as sheriffs, constables, justices of the peace &c., to assist in apprehending or confining fugitive slaves. The guarantee plainly leaves the whole business, *to the master alone*; simply providing, that the state laws *shall not hinder* him, from apprehending and securing them. There is no room for any other just construction in the case, the words of the guarantee are so very plain; and if there were, it is a sufficient answer, that the construction of laws made against public liberty and general right, should always be *strict*; and in doubtful cases, the leaning should always be in favor of liberty. Either with or without just construction, all the laws enacted by congress and the free states, for the apprehension and delivery of fugitive slaves, are without any constitutional authority; and are therefore *null and void*. Nor has any body any constitutional right and authority, to act under or by virtue of them. All such acts are void and the actors trespassers. Nor does the length of time that these laws have existed, ratify them; any more than it did the laws establishing a bank of the United States; it having been decided, that all constructions of the constitution are to be strict also. Nor has this guarantee any thing to do, with the legal existence of slavery itself; but only to regulate it in one case while it does exist. It was intended to regulate the operation or effect; not the existence of slavery.

The constitution also contains a constructive guarantee, (Art. 1, Sec. 8,—Art. 4, Sec. 4,) that so long as slavery *does* exist, slave insurrections, in common with all other insurrections, shall be suppressed by force; but this is no guarantee to support slavery itself by force, or that it shall exist or never be abolished; any more than that free-masonry or any other reserved right shall never be abolished; though *insurrections* to abolish them are to be suppressed. The constitution also contains a constructive provision, (Art. 1, Sec. 2,) that so long as slavery continues to exist, three fifths of the slaves shall be nominally represented in congress, by their masters; a most aristocratical privilege, and equal hardship on northern freemen; for as the slaves have no rights to be represented and protected, and are not permitted to exercise the right of petition, there is no more republican justice, reason or propriety, in such representation, than there would be in that of cattle or horses. But this provision is no guarantee of slavery itself; it being intended to operate only during its continuance. And the sooner slavery is abolished, the better will it be for the political power of the slave states; for their representation in congress will then be increased, by the additional two fifths of their population now unrepresented. There is no paragraph, clause or even constructive provision, in the constitution of the United States, that slavery shall continue or not be abolished. On that subject the constitution is wholly silent.

And were it not for long established construction and practice under the constitution, and even perhaps with them, there is the strongest internal proof in the constitution itself, that slavery is unconstitutional; and of course void under that instrument; for it violates the *whole spirit*, and often the *letter*, of the instrument. Slavery is a direct violation, of all the republican *objects* and *principles*, and some of the *express guarantees* of the constitution. No honest person will dispute their utter repugnance to each other; and that in order to give full effect to the constitution in practice, slavery must cease to exist. A total stranger to our institutions and customs, would be amazed to be told, that the constitution of the United States *protected slavery!* He would need the strongest evidence *out* of the constitution, (for he would find none *in* it,) to convince him of a fact so curious and astonishing. If left with no other light than what the instrument itself afforded, he would at once decide that it condemned slavery; and though it did not abolish the curse in words, it did by necessary implication. Let us briefly examine, both the spirit and letter of those parts of the constitution, that affect the existence of Human Oppression, and see if *they* support slavery; or rather if *they* do not wholly condemn it.

'First then; the *preamble* to the constitution declares, that 'the *people*' (are not slaves 'people'!) 'in order to form a more *perfect union*,' (slavery produces nothing but *disunion* and discord,) 'establish *justice*,' (what is more *unjust* than slavery?,) 'insure *domestic tranquillity*,' (slavery constantly *disturbs* it,) 'provide for the *common defence*,' (slavery most of all things weakens and destroys such defence,) 'promote the *general welfare*,' (slavery above all things impairs it,) and 'secure the blessings of (what. *slavery*? No but) *liberty* &c'; (what 'blessings' and 'liberty' are there in slavery?) 'do ordain and establish &c.' Slavery directly and pointedly violates the *whole spirit*, and almost every *letter* of this preamble.

Again; congress has power, (Art. 1, Sec. 8,) to lay and collect taxes &c. to provide for the *common* defence and *general* welfare &c.' Who could imagine from these *words*, that the 'welfare' of the coloured people in 'common' with others, was not intended? And what 'welfare' is there in slavery? Here is another plain violation of the letter and spirit both. So long as slavery exists in this country, it will be impossible wholly to fulfil the expressed intent of this article The '*common* defence' and '*general* welfare' cannot be fully provided for. It is nonsense to talk of congressional legislation, for the 'defence and welfare' of *slaves*.

Again; congress has power, 'to regulate commerce . . . . . among the several states.' Here is authority to prohibit the horrid traffic in slaves, between the several states; it having been decided by congressional construction, that this clause warrants a total prohibition of commerce with foreign countries; and the words being the same for 'the several states,' as for those countries, congress must have the same power over their commerce. Could any mortal imagine, without evidence out of the constitution, that containing this provision without any restriction or exception, it was intended to support slavery? Slaves being 'goods and chattels,' the trade in them must be subject to the same constitutional authority, that the trade in other goods and chattels is.

Again; 'the *citizens* of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities, of *citizens* in the several states.' Would any body imagine from these *words*, that it was intended citizenship should depend on *colour!* Or that free coloured people were not intended to be *as free*, (that is, to have as many 'privileges and immunities,') as other 'citizens'? Or that if coloured men are citizens, by the laws of one state, (as some are,) they are not to be 'citizens,' and have all the 'privileges and immunities' of citizens, in each of the other states? The *spirit* of slavery leads to direct violations of this provision, in most of the states; and the practice itself will prevent its full operation, until it is abolished.

Again; 'the United States (Art. 4, Sec. 4,) shall guarantee a *republican* form of government &c.' to every state. Now every intelligent reader, would naturally infer from these *words*, that this 'guarantee' was to be, of 'forms' *exclusively* 'republican.' But the 'form' as well as substance of the 'government,' of every slave state, is partly 'republican' and partly despotic.—These governments *in substance and effect*, are no more 'republican,' than the government of Algiers. Slavery is a violation both direct and indirect, of this provision.

Again; all the *amendments* to the constitution, are wholly incompatible with the existence of slavery. By them, the rights of conscience, speech, the press, trial by jury &c. &c., are guaranted *in words*, in the most solemn and ample manner, to the '*people*' generally, without any proviso, restriction, exception or qualification whatever. In *words*, substance and effect, the right of 'trial by jury' is fully guaranteed to fugitive slaves; and were construction necessary, were the question of such right at all doubtful from the *words*, the rule just mentioned of construction 'in favor of liberty,' would in any just, impartial court, and especially in ours which recognize and enforce the common law, and profess to be guided by its rules of construction, instantly award such slaves the right. And although they have been deprived of it by unconstitutional laws, it is a plain case that they have it by the constitution. Slavery is a direct violation, of the express words of several of these Amendments. All slaves (who are all '*people*' also) are totally deprived of every one of the rights, guaranteed by the express words of those Amendments.

It is unnecessary to quote any further specifications, to prove that the practice of slavery is utterly hostile, to the letter and spirit of the constitution of the United States. But here the blasphemous maxim that '*slaves have no rights*,' even though secured to them by the words of constitutions, interferes, and is allowed to control the constitution, and prohibit its beneficial operation, in favor of one sixth part of the whole population! And instead of just and legal construction being applied to this instrument, in *favor* of the just rights of this unfortunate and insulted class of people, and as they are uniformly applied in other cases, all the just rules of construction are generally perverted and violated, to make the constitution an instrument of their oppression and degradation! No stronger proof of the moral corruption, of the bench, the bar and the legislative assemblies of the nation, could be exhibited, than what they have themselves thus furnished.

Yet the slaveholders and their apologists are engaged, in making the country ring with their appeals to the *constitution*, in behalf of slavery and against the abolitionists! This is their constant theme of declamation, entreaty and remonstrance. No matter how much the just laws of God and man are outraged by it; the abomination as they pretend, being fully guaranteed and

protected by the constitution, they insist, that slavery must be their just and sacred right! All are 'traitors,' 'disorganizers,' 'fanatics' and every thing else that is wicked and vile, who dare to deny the constitutionality, justice or policy of slavery. I do not believe the common rules of morality, common honesty and decency, were ever before treated with such utter recklessness of contempt, as they are now treated in the United States, for the support of slavery.

The constitution neither expressly permits nor forbids the practice of slavery, nor of many other crimes punishable by state laws. Nor does it impliedly forbid many other crimes, more than it does slavery. It is entirely silent respecting them. If therefore slavery is constitutional, in the usual sense of that term, then are most cases of murder, arson, counterfeiting and other crimes constitutional! Certainly, if these crimes were as customary as slavery is, they would all be as constitutional, as that is pretended to be. The United States has no jurisdiction, over crimes not mentioned in the constitution; and which are therefore, within the *exclusive* jurisdiction of the several states. The cognizance of such crimes is a reserved state right. But does such reservation render those crimes CONSTITUTIONAL! Have we a 'constitutional' right to rob, ravish and murder each other, for *this* reason!! To pretend therefore as some do, that every thing is constitutional, which is not *forbidden* by the constitution of the United States, is absurd. The truth is, that under that constitution, slavery is neither constitutional nor unconstitutional; for that constitution says nothing about it in *words;* though wholly opposed to it in spirit, as already stated. Slavery is constitutional and legal only, by virtue of *state* constitutions, laws and customs; and none of these can constitutionally prohibit, the use of moral means to abolish it; and the only reason why other crimes are not constitutional, in the sense that slavery is, is because they are not *customary;* as slavery is. The direct legal cognizance of slavery and its abolition, out of the District of Columbia and the Territories, is left entirely to the state jurisdictions; congress having no constitutional authority to interfere with them. So far as 'silence gives consent' in such a case, the constitution of the United States *permits* slavery, and all other crimes against state constitutions, laws and customs. But that it and other crimes are constitutional in any other sense, by virtue of *that* constitution, is untrue.

Let us next examine the celebrated *Compromise*, about which so much is said; and the nature of which we have just inspected; a 'compromise' to which if it were true, the slaves were no party; and by which of course, they were not bound. This is said to have taken place among the several states, at the time of the adoption of the constitution. The debates attending the fabrication of that instrument were secret; and but scanty accounts of them have ever been published. President Madison's manuscripts it is supposed, would reveal them very fully; but their publication is yet delayed. But from Luther Martin's report and other sources, I have learned and believe, that the correct history of this 'Compromise' is as follows. During the preparation of the constitution, many important state claims were compromised and settled, before its final adoption. Among other interesting subjects debated, was that of slavery; Dr. Franklin and other abolition members, wishing to abolish American slavery, by means of the constitution At this proposal, the whole southern delegation revolted; and utterly refused to ratify the instrument, if it 'interfered' *at all with* slavery. They claimed and demanded, the sole legal jurisdiction of it, to the states in which it prevailed by custom; and in which it had not been abolished; and wholly refused to grant any power over it in those states, to the United States. And they even demanded, that three-fifths of their slaves, should be represented in congress, in the manner already stated. They did however from selfish motives finally agree, that the *foreign* slave trade should be abolished in 1808; it being supposed that by that time, the domestic supply of slaves, would be equal to the wants of the home market, and that the foreign trade would then be an injury to the domestic trade. Excepting this and the other constructive provisions already noticed, they insisted, that the constitution should leave slavery untouched, to the sole legal control, of the states in which the practice prevailed. Their unprincipled demands were for the sake of union acceded to. The real *compromise* was, that, with the constructive exceptions before mentioned, the constitution should let the subject of slavery entirely alone; that the constitution SHOULD NOT, not that it *should*, at all meddle with slavery. To obtain any *direct* support for slavery in the constitution, was probable impossible; as the voices of the members must have been, metaphorically speaking, still hoarse with the praises of the far famed 'Declaration,' that 'ALL men are by nature equal &c.' And they were in fact so ashamed of the indirect support, they gave to the abomination in the constitution, that they left this support wholly to *construction*, not daring to pollute the 'sacred' instrument, with the word 'slavery.' And this is the famous '*Compromise*,' the spirit of which it is contended the abolitionists are every day violating.—There was no 'compromise,' that abolitionists or others, should let slavery alone; but that the *constitution* should; that it should be neutral, and neither support nor oppose it. Slavery, like all the other numerous institutions, practises and customs untouched by the constitution, was left to the *legal* control, of the states and people among whom it prevailed; and to the *moral* control of the whole world. It was left as constitutional a subject for examination, discussion, criticism, denunciation, moral attack and legal abolition, as christianity, infidelity, free masonry, and all other reserved rights were and yet are. It is constitutional only in the same sense these institutions are: being as before stated, silently 'permitted,' (not guaranteed,) by the constitu-

tion of the United States. The objection is therefore as false, as it is scandalously immoral.

It has been frequently said, that the constitution was the result of '*mutual* concessions.' This in regard to slavery, is not true. All the 'concessions' made respecting slavery, for the sake of the 'union,' have been on one side only; that is, from liberty to slavery. A representation by the masters of three fifths of the slaves, was 'conceded.' The right of retaking fugitive slaves in the free states was 'conceded.' The erection of several new slaveholding states has been 'conceded,' &c. A great many such 'concessions' have been made to slavery; and all for the sake of 'union.' But not one has ever been made to liberty for that object. The free states have never had a single exclusive privilege 'conceded' to them. The slave states enjoy all the other constitutional rights, privileges and guarantees, *in common* with the free states. All the 'concessions' have been for their exclusive benefit. And now a final 'concession' is demanded by them, of the suppression of constitutional freedom of speech and the press, still for the sake it is said of *union*; but in reality of slavery! And a multitude of patriotic 'unionists' in the free states, are for 'conceding' those rights also! What is any 'union' worth without those rights? And what kind of 'patriotism' is that, which prefers *such* 'union' to liberty?

Much noise has been made about the 'interference' of the abolitionists, with the *legal rights* of the slaveholders; the insinuation being always as before remarked, an *illegal* 'interference.' The abolitionists in the free states have not a legal right, to *pass laws* to abolish slavery in the slave states; nor have they ever claimed or sought or proposed to exercise any such right. But they have a constitutional and legal right, to make abolitionists of the slaveholders; which will produce the same effect: and they have the legal right, to use all the just and legal moral means before enumerated, for that purpose. And these are all the legal rights they claim or have sought to exercise, in relation to slavery or its abolition. They freely admit, that according to the corrupt and wicked customs of the slave states, slavery is a legal right, or rather wrong; but they say it is not a *just* or *Divine* right, like the rights which God has given to all men; that it is a right established by wicked custom only, in plain violation of Divine rights; or in other words, that it is a legalized *wrong* or sin; and as such they have not only a legal right, but are under the highest moral or Divine obligations, to attack and destroy it, in a legal manner and by legal means. They seek to abolish, not any rights that are guaranteed by the constitution; but wrongs that are *not* guaranteed by it. They say that God never gave the right of slavery, but forbade it under the penalty of death; and man therefore ought to abolish it instantly. The means the abolitionists use for that purpose, are not only strictly moral but strictly legal; and they will use no other; because there is no necessity they should. They will neither break the constitution nor constitutional laws for that purpose. There is no necessity they should. The constitution (Amendments, Art. 1, &c.) guarantees to them, ample privileges and means to destroy slavery; and provided they can have the free use of these, they desire no other. These privileges and means they derive from God, as was shown in the First Lecture. But they are still further *protected*, because 'guaranteed' by the constitution. Under the protection of this instrument, they have a constitutional right to pass *resolutions* (not laws,) against slavery in the slave states: and to talk, write, print, distribute, preach, pray, harangue, lecture and inveigh against the abomination, as much as they please in any part of the union; all which means will finally destroy slavery, as effectually as express laws will; because like other crimes, slavery cannot bear their application. So one state has no legal right, to 'interfere' with slavery in another state, by passing *laws* to abolish it there. But they all have a constitutional right, to pass *resolutions* against it; let it exist when and where it will. And each state legislature has a constitutional right, to pass resolutions, relative to the conduct of any other state legislature, or the laws and customs and public acts of any other state. So they all have the same right, to 'interfere' with the proceedings of congress, in the same way; and congress with them. States speak by legislative and conventional resolutions, on all subjects whatever. This is the only way they can speak; a fact that shows the practice must be constitutional. All other bodies or assemblies of men, every where in the United States, except slaves, (and this exception is made by slave custom only; not by the constitution) have the same constitutional right, for the same reason. And whatever is not prohibited by the constitution of the United States, is considered as legal, if the *state* constitutions, laws and customs permit it; and none of these constitutionally, do or can, prohibit the freest use of moral means to abolish slavery. Public bodies or assemblies of men, have the same *right* to express *their* sentiments, that private individuals have. And all men, even slaves, have a *Divine* right, to express their opinions on all subjects whatever. And all constitutions, laws or customs, that prohibit the free exercise of this great fundamental right, are eternal *wrongs* or crimes, obnoxious to the Divine displeasure. The pretence therefore so common, that slaveholders only, have the *exclusive* constitutional and legal right, to examine, discuss and decide, upon the merits of slavery, is as false as it is dangerous to the rights of others.

Like the constitution of the United States, the Law of Nations permits slavery; simply by not 'interfering' with, preventing or hindering it. It does not interfere with slavery in any way. It also allows the right of slave rebellions; the same that our forefathers exercised, when they revolted against British tyranny; a right that has been frequently exercised by oppressed people. Like the Common Law, the Law of Nations is derived chiefly from the Law of Nature; and most

of its rules are excellent accordingly. And what few blemishes or defects it contains, (of which the foregoing omission is one,) are like those of the Common Law, caused by the encroachments of aristocracy on human rights.

I will here notice the blasphemous pretence of the *Entailment* of slavery; just as if crime can justify crime; as if the crimes of our ancestors could justify our own; as if sin and crime once commenced, could be transmitted down from generation to generation, so as to absolve posterity from guilt; as if wicked laws and customs continued in practice by the 'dooces in tail,' could produce such absolution; and as if a sufficient accumulation of wrongs, could at length make a great wrong become right. It is frequently said by way of apology for the present slaveholders, that *they* did not introduce slavery; they found it 'entailed' on them as a *misfortune*, of which they cannot rid themselves; but are *obliged* to endure it, &c. It would seem from their conduct however, that if they really considered slavery as their 'misfortune,' it is one of which they are extremely fond, considering the barbarously illegal means they make use of, to preserve the 'entailment.' Strange 'misfortune' this; that those who endure it should strive with all the means they have, both good and bad, to secure its perpetuity! At the adoption of the national constitution, they stipulated for the continuance of the foreign slave trade twenty years; and so long only through regard to their own interest; and have carefully guarded and fortified their 'misfortune,' by laws of increasing rigor ever since! They have procured the admission of two new slave states, whose constitutions forbid the abolition of slavery; and are now endeavoring to procure the same admission, of the horde of slaveholders, felons, outlaws, and other criminals, collected in that 'valley of rascals,' Texas, in the name of liberty, but in reality to introduce, protect and increase this 'misfortune!' Men do not commonly *love*, what they really consider as their 'misfortunes;' and this conduct of the slaveholders, proves the hypocrisy of the pretence.

Let us examine its morality, for it seriously goes the horrid length of justifying sin by *custom!*—which we saw in the First Lecture, only increases its guilt and enormity. Many of our republican citizens who can clearly discern the guilt, of violating or taking away a *part* of a person's rights, (especially if he have a white skin,) appear to act as if they believe, that if the *whole* of those rights can be once taken from innocent persons, and withheld from the owners a sufficient length of time, it is right to *continue* to withhold them; or that perseverance in crime at length justifies it! So powerful an influence has wicked *custom*, to reconcile men's consciences to crime. But it is customary crimes only, that thus blind the consciences of the American people; as their moral sense of other crimes habitually proves. What, for instance, would they think of the morality of a plea, set up by a criminal indicted, under our laws, for murder, that his *ancestors* had been in the habit of committing murder before him; or that in his native country murder is a settled custom! Yet this plea is just as moral as the pretence under consideration is. It is a great sin, to imitate the sins of our ancestors in practice; vide Matt. xxiii 31, 32, Luke xi 47, 48; Acts vii 51, 52, and many other passages. The crimes of our ancestors can never justify our own. Neither can those of our neighbors or cotemporaries. Sin can never excuse sin; for if it could, nobody could ever contract guilt and suffer conviction and punishment, either here or hereafter. Nay, nobody would ever need justification through Christ's atonement! The pretence is most stupidly and recklessly blasphemous. Nor have the abolitionists ever blamed the present slaveholders, for the *origin* or commencement of slavery; though they may suffer for it, (vide Ex. xx 5, xxxiv 7, and several other passages); but only for their *continuance* in the practice: perseverance in sin being as bad or worse than its commencement. Those who first introduced slavery, as well as all but their present living successors in the practice, are, together with the victims of their oppressions, dead and gone to judgment; and we have nothing to do with them, but to shun their wicked example. Nor have the abolitionists ever charged the present slaveholders or their supporters, with the guilt of any but their own acts:—for though they are not responsible for the origin of slavery, they yet are for its continuance. Nor is there any thing in the pretence, of the *inability* of the present slaveholders to emancipate their slaves; except that of their own making. They first tie themselves, and then say they are bound, and *cannot* get loose from laws of their own making. They first make wicked laws against emancipation, and then excuse themselves by saying, that they cannot *legally* emancipate:—that is, they 'take advantage of their own wrongs;' just as if sin could excuse or justify continuance in sin; or as if wicked laws and customs of men, could justly nullify the Law of God! Nothing can be wickedor than such laws, made to perpetuate crime, and *prevent* men from practising righteousness!—vide Matt. xxiii 13. But it is false that the slaveholders *cannot* emancipate. No man was ever yet under the '*necessity*' of committing sin, or continuing in the practice of it. The majority of the slaveholders can repeal these wicked laws; and just as easy as they made them. And if they will not, the minority can disregard them by voluntary manumission, and 'submitting to' their penalties; and if the laws afterwards drag the manumitted slaves to bondage again, *their* skirts are clear; vide Jer. ii 34, Eze. iii 19–21, xxxiii 9, Acts xviii 6, xx 26. It is as safe and easy to quit the practice of slavery, as it is that of intemperance or any other bad habit. Every resident slaveholder in the union, can put an end to slavery on his own plantation in a day; and most of them in an hour: and were they as much disposed to work righteous-

ness as they ought to be, they would all do so. The slaveholders want none but *moral* ability to abolish slavery. Had they the same inclination they have physical ability, slavery would be abolished in a week, all over the United States.

Equally futile is the attempt, to fasten the blame of slavery in the United States, on the *British Government;* just as if the crimes of that government, could justify those of others! That government, like the constitution of the United States, and the Law of Nations, had no agency in the introduction of slavery into the colonies. It did not assist nor prohibit such introduction at all; nor did it do any thing to support the practice, after its introduction. It simply did nothing at all in relation to it. But the colonists *did* encourage the slave trade. They purchased the slaves from the men-stealers who inported them; and thus created a market for the traffic. Nor were they under any *compulsion* to purchase. It was a voluntary act of their own; and to them more than to the British Government, belongs the guilt, of the first introduction of American slavery. That government was to blame for not prohibiting the trade at first, and for not abolishing it afterwards; as the slaveholders are now. But the chief blame in both cases, rests on the colonial slaveholders themselves.

I will here make another passing remark, respecting the denial of the right of petition to *slaves*. The reception of petitions from the poorest and vilest of persons, is an attribute or prerogative of the Almighty; and for *man* to deny it, must therefore be blasphemous. For a worm of the dust to assume prerogatives higher than his Maker, is a stretch of impiety, that none but the greatest criminals would dare to indulge in. Nor is apprehended *abuse* of this right, any just reason for its denial any more than for the denial of any or all the other rights. It should also be remarked, that this right is by the common consent of mankind, considered so sacred, that it is not denied in any country on the globe, except in the U. States. This country has carried its blasphemous audacity farther, than the most absolute despots have heretofore dared to do.

I will here in conclusion, make a few remarks, respecting the *legal right* of Congress, to abolish slavery and the slave trade, in the District of Columbia, and the Territories under the jurisdiction of the United States. Congress has the same power over the District and Territories by the constitution, (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Art. 4, Sec. 3.) that every other sovereign state has within its jurisdiction. All states have a constitutional right, to abolish crimes within their limits; and do constantly exercise this right. They are called '*sovereign*' because they possess this among other sovereign or constitutional rights; and could not be 'sovereign' unless they did possess it. It is also the Divine duty of such states, to abolish all crimes among their subjects; as the Scripture passages already quoted prove. Their moral obligation is within their jurisdictions, the same as that of individuals. Congress has therefore the undoubted legal right and duty, to abolish the *crime* of slavery within those jurisdictions; the same that it has to abolish all other crimes, and for the same reason; because slavery is a *crime*. Nobody doubts the legal or constitutional power of congress, to abolish the crimes of murder, rape, common robbery, counterfeiting, forgery, &c. in those places; and were it not for the moral blindness and depravity produced by slavery, nobody would doubt its right to abolish that also. And in fact nobody ever has doubted or pretended to doubt this power; but every body admitted it, till very recently; when the subject of abolition has been seriously agitated. Statesmen in every part of the union, until lately unanimously concurred, in the existence of this right in congress; all believing in the existence of this power, as much in the case of one crime as another. The one case is *on its merits*, as plain as another; slavery being as great a crime, as is or can be committed within those jurisdictions. This is the principal reason, why the various state legislatures in the free states, abolished slavery within their limits; because like murder, &c. it was a *crime*; and as such it was their sovereign right and duty, to abolish it without the least hesitation or unnecessary delay. Nor has congress any more right to look to *consequences*, in the abolition of this crime, than in the abolition of other crimes and criminal practices. If slavery be a high crime and on all accounts destructive of human happiness, (as nobody can honestly doubt it is,) it is the imperative, moral, political and religious duty of congress to abolisht within those jurisdictions immediately, without any regard to supposed or imagineb evil consequences.

It is contended by some that congress has no right, to abolish the *vested rights*, alias vested wrongs, of the slaveholders, in the District and Territories; just as if sin could become honestly 'vested,' and of course justified, by long customary indulgence in it; for this is the morality of the pretence. But this is not true; if those 'vested' rights are *unjust*. Every slave right *is* an eternal wrong or crime; and every wrong or crime ought to be instantly abolished. It is no injury to any man, to deprive him of his unjust rights, or rather his wrongs; or to disturb him in their exercise. No man ought ever to be permitted, to exercise any unjust rights for a moment; whether they be 'vested' or not. This doctrine is well understood to be true in every other case. Least of all ought those rights that are *mala in se*, like that of slavery, to remain 'vested' in any body for a moment. To call slave '*rights*' by that name is a misnomer. To convey true ideas of their real nature, they ought always to be called slave *wrongs*. Every 'vested right' to commit crimes is a vested wrong merely; and ought to be immediately abolished. Abolition in the District and Territories would restore to the slaves, that which justly belongs to them; and would deprive their owners of nothing that ever justly belonged to them; and of

course no injustice will be done, and somebody benefitted and nobody injured by the measure. The pretence is founded on the assumption, that custom justifies crime or criminal ownership: whereas it only aggravates the crime. As to the wishes of the slaveholders: their just and virtuous desires ought to be consulted: but not their criminal desires. Their desire to retain their *slavery* for instance, (which is a 'vested right' to commit crimes only,) ought justly to be disregarded. The time already passed by them in the sin and guilt of slavery, ought to suffice to procure their contented and cheerful acquiescence; vide Exo. xliv 6,—xlv 9,—Acts xvii 30,—1 Pet. iv 3.

It is also contended by many, that the latter part of Art. 5, of the Amendments to the constitution, commencing with '*nor be depriced*' &c, prohibits congress from emancipating slaves in the District and Territories, without compensation &c. To this I reply: First; that the slaves (who are 'persons') have been 'deprived of liberty' either with or without 'due process of law.' If they *have been* thus deprived, then the law for their emancipation must also be 'due process': one law being as much 'due process' as another. If they have *not* been thus deprived, there is an end to the objection of want of 'due process' for the slaves having been 'deprived of liberty' *without* 'due process,' are all free under the constitution. And if it be further contended, that 'due process' means writs and other *judicial* process, then I say, that as the slaves have never been 'deprived of liberty' by *such* process, they are all free under the constitution. And further I say, that by the *words* of this Article, every slave in the United States, is entitled to his freedom under the constitution! So much for the 'guarantee' of slavery by this instrument! Secondly; by emancipation, congress will not take the slaves for 'public use;' and Thirdly, as the Article expressly says '*just* compensation,' we are not at liberty to suppose it applies to cases of *unjust* compensation, as all slave compensation clearly is; as has been already fully proven.

And as to apprehended *evil* consequences to result from such abolition, such as creating uneasiness among the surrounding slaves, affording an asylum to runaways, example to the slave states, (which are *not* 'evil' consequences) &c.; how easily, as Mr. Stanton justly remarks, can the slaveholders *avoid* the effects of those supposed 'consequences,' *simply by abolishing slavery themselves!* This simple remedy is not only a divine duty, but is perfectly safe and sure, and highly advantageous both to slaveholders and slaves; as has been abundantly shown. The slaveholders may thus turn all these 'consequences,' into the greatest blessings to themselves and their friends; and if they will not avoid 'evil consequences' of their own procuring, by the easy application of a safe and righteous remedy, the sin and blame of the neglect or refusal, will rest only on themselves. As the District and Territories now are, they are an 'asylum' only for slaveholders and other criminals; who if they had justice done them, would soon be provided with another kind of 'asylum.' The disgrace which every where attaches to the national character, in consequence of the slave marts and auctions, and other slavery in the District, as well as the injury done to the cause of republican principles and freedom, is so great, that the injuries they produce, ought to be terminated as soon as possible. And as no bad consequences can follow the measure, unless they are the voluntary produce of slavery, it is to be hoped the national legislature, will soon have sufficient justice and wisdom given it, to adopt it without unnecessary delay.

The same is the moral and religious duty of the legislature of every slave state; and for the same reasons. All the legislatures of the slave states are bound, by the highest obligations, (Divine obligations,) that can bind mankind, to abolish slavery within their respective jurisdictions immediately, by law, without any regard to 'consequences.'

I ought in conclusion to remark, that those who have insisted so loudly, that the abolitionists are violating the spirit of the constitution, are seldom known to express any indignation, at the reckless actual violations of the constitution of the United States, not merely by mobs and slavite fanatics, but by southern legislatures, for the suppression of the abolition enterprise. Notwithstanding the perfect notoriety of the dreadful facts, that either by unconstitutional slave legislation, or the spirit of mobocracy, or both together, constitutional freedom of speech and of the press against slavery and in favor of its abolition, are utterly prohibited and suppressed in the slave states, and to a considerable extent in some of the free states, they manifest no indignation or alarm on account of it! It is only the particular kind of pretended violations of the constitution, by the abolitionists, that they are concerned about. They are shocked at all 'interference' with the 'rights' of slaveholders; but consider the customary 'interference' of the latter, to destroy all the rights of their own slaves, conduct every way just and proper! The right of slavery is with them sacred. But the total destruction of all other rights gives them no trouble at all!

10th Obj. —*Injury to Slaves.*

It is earnestly and confidently asserted, by persons who were never known before, to be moved or affected by any *other* source of injury to slaves, that the abolitionists are doing more hurt than good to the slaves, by their mistaken philanthropy; that *they* are increasing the severity of their treatment, riveting their chains, increasing the 'necessary' rigors of their bondage. And this false notion seems to have attained some credence, even among honest people; who dread lest the slaves should be injured, by the benevolent exertions now making in their behalf. Let us examine the merits of the pretence.

Suppose this false charge to be true, that the *abolitionists* really are riveting the chains of the slaves the tighter, and what would it prove? Why that they are doing just what the slaveholders want they should do! Why then need the latter or their friends complain. They have no intention of emancipating their slaves themselves; and wish to secure their enslavement in the most effectual manner. According to the pretence then, they ought to be grateful to the abolitionists, for their valuable assistance and support in the defence of slavery; instead of anathematising and persecuting them as they do. Certain it is on their own showing by this charge, that *they* have no reason to complain of abolition measures; yet strange to tell, they and their friends are the only persons, who *do* complain of them! And equally strange is it, that the slaves who are said to be the only persons injured, are extremely anxious for the increase of abolition exertions!! Is it possible for a pretence to be *true*, that is contradicted by such conduct? And if the denunciations of the abolitionists, have fortified slavery and retarded its abolition, by enraging the slaveholders, then the preaching of the gospel must have fortified heathenism for the same reason; for that preaching met with the same opposition at first, that abolition preaching now does! Moreover, if opposition to slavery will increase the sufferings of slaves, why did God command men to make such opposition? Would He issue commands *injurious* to His creatures! Can 'injury' result from obedience to his perfect Laws!

It is said the slaveholders hold their slaves with a 'firmer grasp,' in consequence of abolition efforts. So did Pharaoh the Hebrews; but did this render the conduct of Moses and Aaron improper? So did the British goverment seize the colonies with a 'firmer grasp,' on account of the resistance made to its tyranny. Such resistance always increases the rage of tyrants at first. So did the heathen idolators hold to their superstitions and abominations, with a 'firmer grasp,' in consequence of the preaching of the apostles; and used mobs and all manner of persecution to support them. The most savage laws were made and enforced, to protect the 'peculiar institutions' of the heathen. So did the Pope and his tools hold to catholic superstitions and abuses, with a 'firmer grasp,' on account of the preaching of Luther and the other reformers; who did not delay the reformation 'two hundred years' by such preaching neither; as it is said the abolitionists have abolition by theirs. None of those corruptionists were any more willing, to tolerate what they called 'error of opinion,' than the slaveholders now are, by leaving their 'reason alone to combat it.' They knew very well, as the slaveholders now know, that mere reason could not support their 'peculiar institutions'; but that if left to its unrestrained operation, it would quickly destroy them. Hence they all passed laws as the slaveholders now do, to restrain reason entirely, from all 'interference' with their 'peculiar institutions.'

The charge of the pretence is, that the abolitionists *compel* the slaveholders to use increased severity towards the slaves, to insure their own safety. If it be meant in the same sense, that the operation of good laws compels criminals, to the exercise of greater caution in the commission of crimes, there is considerable plausibility in the charge, however false it may be in reality; for such laws sometimes 'cause' thieves and other rogues, a great deal of trouble; and thus *compel* them in the sense of the pretence, to use more caution and pains in practising their villany. The moral restraint of abolition is as troublesome to slaveholders, as legal restraint is to other criminals. The charge also cannot be true in any other sense but this, because slavery is one of the greatest crimes that can be committed; and if it were not, mere intellectual and moral opposition to it, would produce no danger to those who practice it.—

Whoever fears any danger, from such opposition to his virtuous actions or principles? None but criminals ever yet had any such fear. Slavery itself has nothing to fear, if it is right, and if it is wrong, it ought to be destroyed. And suppose the charge to be true, in the cases under consideration; are the laws in the one case and the efforts of the abolitionists in the other, *wrong*, or to blame? May verily; they are the more virtuous and meritorious, because they expose criminals to danger. Laws and other measures that render crimes hazardous, must be good means; and those who use them, deserving of praise rather than blame. Admitting the truth of the charge; the objectors will still be obliged to prove, that slavery is a virtuous practice, and that the slaveholders have a *just* right to pursue it; for if it is not, the abolitionists are justifiable, for how can they incur guilt or deserve blame, for causing danger to criminals in the practice of their crimes? There is no more justice in blaming the abolitionists in such a case, than in blaming an officer of the law, for punishing a condemned criminal. The true blame would still rest against slavery; not against abolition. What would be thought of the morality of a man, who instead of blaming a criminal for the commission of murder, should blame the *law* that punishes him!, or should blame the various officers, judges, &c. who enforced the law! Yet the morality of this pretence is precisely the same; because abolition endangers nothing but injustice and crime. If a man be punished for crime, the punishment and all the other consequences *to him*, are chargeable only to *his guilt*. In the same manner, the consequences attending the practice of slavery, *at all times before its abolition*, are chargeable only to the guilt of slavery. Those only who commit sin are responsible for its consequences; not those who punish or otherwise endanger it.

It is pretended, that the abolitionists produce this necessity for additional severity, by agitating the subject of slavery, and thereby rendering the slaves uneasy and rebellious; in consequence of which it is pretended, (not proved,) that the slaveholders are obliged to use increased rigor, in order to govern their slaves as before. It is not pretended, so far as I know or believe, that the abolitionists have *advised* or encouraged this pretended increase of rigor;—for it is notorious, that they have uniformly implored the slaveholders, to release their victims from bondage, and treat them with humanity, justice and equity. This alleged increase of the rigors of slavery, cannot therefore be because the slaveholders have been *misled*, by the advice or example of the abolitionists; but because they have acted contrary to both. Had they followed them, all danger whether fancied or real, would have disappeared long ago; and of course this pretended 'necessity' could not have existed. It has not often been pretended, that the abolitionists have advised or encouraged, the *slaves* to insurbordination and rebellion. This falsehood is too glaring and notorious, to render its frequent use advisable. It is maintained only in particular places and on special occasions. And as to 'agitation,' in the *dangerous* sense of the term, the abolitionists do not 'agitate' slavery at all. It is ABOLITION they 'agitate,' and press upon the country; and there is no danger in *that*, as we have clearly seen. Nor does the *mode* or manner in which they treat slavery, tend at all to increase its dangers; but greatly to lessen them, both to master and slave; as we shall presently explain.

'Necessity,' of his own producing, is always the tyrant's plea, and in the present case, it is said to be a 'necessity' that abolition (not slavery) creates. A similar excuse ('necessity' produced by temptation,) was first used at the fall of man—vide Gen. iii 12, 13; and never was a crime committed since, without some kind of 'necessity' as an excuse for it. It has been set up thousands of times, to justify criminal opposition to the true religion, and all manner of righteousness. The same kind of 'agitation' and disturbance produced by it, were charged by ancient corruptionists, on our Saviour and the prophets, apostles and martyrs, namely, that by the proclamation of the truth and righteousness, *they* raised excitement and produced trouble and danger—vide 1st Kings xviii 17, 18, xxi 20, Luke xxiii 2, 5, 10, 14, John xi 48, Acts xvi 20, 21, xvii 5–7, xix, 23–41, xxi 28, and other passages. The Jews said it was *they* the reformers, (not the corruptions of the times,) that created disturbance, and raised the 'necessity' for opposition to their preaching. Luther, Calvin, Knox, Wesley, and all other great reformers, had the same false charges brought against them. Luther and his followers were charged with the guilt and responsibility, of all the massacres of the protestants by the catho-

lics; just as the Roman emperors pretended they were 'compelled' to persecute the martyrs. The protestant massacres were 'necessary' the Pope said, to extinguish the heresy introduced by Luther; and that he and the other heretics only, were responsible for the guilt of those massacres. So the blame of our revolutionary troubles, was charged by the British government and the tories, on the leaders of the revolution. These men that government pretended, (not its own oppressions,) fomented the rebellious spirit of the colonies. and thus 'compelled' the government, to the exercise of greater severity, than would otherwise have been necessary. So all the blame of the 'horrors of St. Domingo,' was charged by the French government on the negroes; as it is by slaveholders and their advocates yet. The blame of the revolutionary troubles in Ireland, Greece and Poland, was thrown on the patriots who fought for freedom, in those unfortunate enterprises. Such false pretences are very common in history. All tyrants make them of course; *and none but tyrants, and other criminals, were ever known to make them.* No other persons are ever found wicked enough to make them.

That slavery is the only real and true *cause,* of the pretended dangers falsely charged on abolition, is thus easily proved. Were all human slavery, and other oppression, now wholly abolished, 'incendiary circulars' of every description might be multiplied and circulated *ad infinitum,* without producing the slightest dangerous effect to any body. But so long as slavery is supported, the greatest dangers will always attend the practice, to every body concerned in or effected by it; and either with or without 'circulars' of any description. These facts prove clearly, that these pretended dangers do not exist in the nature of abolition, or in that of the means used to promote and procure it; but in that of *slavery alone.* Were the slaveholders now totally to abolish slavery, the truth of this doctrine would appear in a week. For were the 'incendiary circulars' of the abolitionists, to be multiplied and circulated a million fold, after such abolition, they would not produce the slightest dangerous effect. If their design really was rebellious excitement, every body would despise their falsity and ridicule their object.—Such 'circulars' intended to 'excite' the free people of this country, would only be laughed at; as well known falsehoods always are. Thus is it clearly proven, that it is the moral corruption engendered by slavery alone, that has produced all the 'increased rigors' of slavery, whether real or pretended; all the horrors of 'Lynch law,' or mob outrage and murder, and all the other breaches of the constitution, since the commencement of the abolition controversy; and the guilt of them all will at the 'great day,' be imputed only to the supporters of slavery.

It is sometimes said that the slaveholders have never *injured* the abolitionists; and the latter have therefore no right to injure them. I readily grant that the abolitionists have no right to injure the slaveholders, whether the latter have injured them or not; nor have the abolitionists ever attempted to injure them, by attempting to abolish slavery with the means they use; as has been abundantly shown. The righteous, voluntary abolition of slavery, *cannot* work injury to any body. The relinquishment of unjust rights never yet did or can 'injure' any person He loses nothing by such relinquishment that justly belongs to him; how then can he be injured by it? But it is not true, that the slaveholders have 'never injured' the abolitionists. Whoever injures my neighbour, injures me and all mankind; as the Law of God and the common law both declare. And as abolition works benefit, so slavery in all its effects and consequences, works constant injury and nothing but injury, to all mankind. It injures them by the dangerous precedent it sets. For if it be held right to enslave any part of mankind innocent of crime, it is of course held right to enslave the whole; and thus the freedom of the whole is continually endangered; as the present moral and political crisis in this country fully demonstrates. It injures all mankind, by the manifold corruption, tyranny, poverty and misery it produces, and tends every where to produce. There is not an abolitionist living, but who has in more ways than one, been personally injured by slavery. The common law correctly supposes this consequence, in the case of *public* wrongs and injuries; of which slavery is one of the greatest—vide 4 Blac. Com. 5, 6. It might as well be pretended, that a criminal sentenced for his crimes, has 'never injured' the court and jury who try him, or the officers who execute the sentence; and that they have therefore 'no right' to try, sentence and punish him; as that the abolitionists have 'no right' to attempt to abolish slavery by just and legal

means, for want of personal injury. Whoever injures an innocent person, injures me and all mankind; for the plain and obvious reasons here given. Besides, the pretence does not effect deny the right to 'deliver the oppressed,' though God has commanded it as a duty; and is therefore blasphemous. The Bible does not say 'deliver the oppressed,' *provided* such deliverance does not 'injure' the oppressors. The oft repeated command is, to 'deliver them' at all events; without any restriction, exception or qualification. And this command is obligatory on all mankind, slaveholders as well as others. All mankind are thus under a *Divine* obligation, to attempt to abolish slavery immediately; and those who have power to, to make the attempt, incur heavy guilt every moment they neglect it. Nor is it true that the abolitionists, are unfriendly to the best interests of the slaveholders. They are unfriendly to their crimes only. And they manifest their friendship for them, by proposing for their adoption, the only best dispesal of slavery that can be made (the disposal that God has commanded) in order to promote and secure their own best interests, both temporal and eternal; as has been clearly shown. How then do the abolitionists 'injure' them? Thus also does the falsity of the pretence appear, that they are the 'enemies' of the slaveholders; as they are commonly said to be. They are the best and only real friends the slaveholders have; vide Ps. cxli 5, Prov. xxvii 6. The slaveholders are their own worst enemies; (Prov. x 17, xii 1;) and next to themselves are those, who endeavor to sustain them in the exercise of their slave rights.

But the pretence of 'increased severity' is as false in *fact* as it is in principle. An extensive and careful inquiry at the anti-slavery office in the city of New York, has proven, that the general treatment of slaves at the south, is better now than it was before the anti-slavery excitement began. This result was to have been expected, as the natural effect of the excitement. When the wicked conduct of bad people is watched and criticised, published and severely censured, without their ability to arrest or control the criticism and censure, they always become more circumspect in their wickedness. This effect uniformly follows such causes. Nor has the agitation of the subjects of slavery and abolition, rendered the government of slaves more difficult. It has rendered it even less so; by rendering the slaves more patient, submissive and cheerful. This result was also to be expected, as the effect of the excitement. So long as the slaves knew their friends are at work, endeavoring to effect their liberation by effectual means, and that the number and zeal of those friends is increasing, the ray of hope which such knowledge imparts, will render them peaceable and patient. It is *despair* only that urges men to rebellion. Besides, many of the slaves doubtless know, that the abolitionists use none but moral and religious means to procure their liberty; and utterly disclaim and condemn the use of any other; and they will therefore, for the sake of their friends, continue to bear their grievous oppressions, with patience and resignation. For these very natural reasons it is, that slavery is less dangerous to the slaveholders now, than it was before the excitement began.

But inasmuch as the pretence indirectly imputes guilt to the abolitionists; let us examine the truth of this imputation. For the sake of testing it, let us suppose it actually true, that the abolitionists do render the practice of slavery, more dangerous to the slaveholders than it used to be. When and where and by what just law I ask, was it ever held a *crime*, or cause of guilt or a *guilty* cause, to render a wicked practice or crime more dangerous to criminals? Certainly it is not by the Law of God, or by the common law, or by any other just law; for those laws themselves render crimes more dangerous to criminals. If we do not ourselves commit crimes for the purpose, nothing else that we can do to render crimes more dangerous to criminals, can incur moral guilt. We can offend against none but criminal laws or moral wrongs by so doing; and such offence is righteousness only. If our acts offend against no *just* law, we work righteousness instead of sin. Even therefore if the pretence were *true*, it must first be shown, that the abolitionists have broken *just* laws by their conduct, before they can justly be chargeable with moral guilt. The absurdity of the consequences of a contrary doctrine, show the falsity of the charge. For according to the spirit of it, all the legislators who make just laws for the punishment of crimes, all the judges and executive officers who enforce and execute such laws, and all who expose and denounce those who violate them, must themselves commit crimes and incur moral guilt, by so doing; for they render the practice of crime more dangerous! The spirit of the pretence is, that moral opposition to immo-

ral actions or crimes is wrong, because it may expose the criminals to danger; which exposure is one principal object of laws made against crimes! And supposing that in consequence of the increased danger to crime, from the operation of such laws, the criminals should be under the 'necessity,' (as it is called in the case of slavery,) of committing additional crimes, to screen themselves from the danger of punishment; would the guilt of those additional crimes be justly imputable to those legislators, judges and officers! Would the additional sufferings, of the victims of those 'necessary' crimes, be justly chargeable to their account? Certainly not; because they did right in making and enforcing the laws. And yet it is just as clear, that *they* were the 'causes' of the pretended 'necessity' of those additional crimes and sufferings, as that the abolitionists are the 'cause,' of the pretended increase of slave dangers and slave cruelties. On the same ground guilt would be imputable to *God;* for he renders the commission of crime infinitely dangerous!! When a criminal is punished for a crime, many causes usually operate to produce the punishment. All the steps taken to produce that effect are operative causes; but the only *guilty* cause, is the crime itself for which punishment is inflicted; and the criminal is the *only* guilty actor, to whom all the guilt is imputable. And all the actors, except the criminal himself, are innocent actors; innocent not only of the sufferings of the criminal, but of those of his victims. So it is in the principal subject under consideration. Were it as true as it is false, that the treatment of the slaves is more rigorous than it used to be, still slavery is the only *guilty* cause of that pretended increase of rigor, and the slaveholders and their supporters the only guilty actors in it. The acts of the abolitionists in such case are innocent acts; and not only innocent, but righteous and highly meritorious; being performed in obedience to the Law of God. Terrible persecutions followed the mission of the apostles. Dreadful massacres followed the preaching of Luther,—yet the efforts of the apostles and of Luther, to overthrow the corruptions of their times, were among the most righteous and meritorious acts they ever performed. And the imputation of guilt to the abolitionists, involves the blasphemous absurdity, of pronouncing the Saviour, and all the prophets, apostles and martyrs, criminals! Nay, it involves the still higher blasphemy, of imputing guilt to God himself, in obedience to whose commands they all acted!!

Besides, there cannot in reality be any 'necessity' for increased rigor, because there is none for the continuance of slavery. I never heard any such 'necessity' pretended, except by gradualists; and they had no right to pretend it—because the pretence is false, as before shown. Any resident slaveholder can at any time, put an end to the practice in an hour; and thus deliver himself from this 'necessity,' whether it be real or pretended. The abolitionists *have* a just right and duty both, to prosecute all their measures; but the slaveholders have no such right or duty to continue slavery. Abolition *is* 'necessary.' for God has commanded it; slavery is not, for He has forbidden it. There is no more 'necessity' for it than there is for murder. Slavery alone 'causes' all the 'necessity' for its rigors and cruelties; and since it is itself unnecessary, as all sin is, all the guilt of those rigors and cruelties, attaches to the slaveholders and their supporters alone.

The proclamation of the truth against error and crime is always a good and holy work, let the consequences to ourselves or others be what they may. The object of the abolitionists is to prevent the commission of crimes, by removing their source and origin—slavery. And let what may happen to the slaves or to any body else, on account of their righteous exertions, they are guiltless of sin in the premises; and will stand justified at the bar of God. All the guilt of the horrors preceding emancipation, will be charged by the Almighty Judge, to the account of their guilty opposers; vide Eze. iii 18, 19, xviii 10–13, xxii, xxxiii 2–5, Acts xviii 6, xx 26, 27, 2d Tim. iv 8.

It is difficult to discover how the measures of the abolitionists, have been a *cause* however innocent, in the usual sense of the term, of the alleged increase of the rigors of slavery. Not until the enemies of abolition can prove that righteousness can produce the 'necessity' of committing crimes, will they also be able to prove, that abolition is a real 'cause' of that alleged increase. The practice of righteousness can never produce any criminal 'necessity' whatever. We have seen how those measures have been a 'cause,' of the real *decrease* of those rigors.

and how can measures directly and powerfully calculated, to weaken and destroy an institution, help to *increase* it or any of its effects! There surely must be some other 'cause' for such 'increase.' But had there been a real increase of those rigors, it is still certain, that the abolitionists have never advised nor aided nor encouraged the slaveholders, to the use of any such rigors whatever. Nor have they ever given them the least just provocation, to treat their slaves with cruelty. They have never slandered the slaveholders; for they have never told any thing but the truth respecting them; and that is no slander; and ought not in such a case to be any libel. Nor is doing one's duty ever a just provocation in any case. Obedience to the commands of God, entreating men to desist from the practice of iniquity, and exhorting them to the practice of righteousness, are never just provocations to sin; for if they be, then Christ, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs and reformers, gave abundance of such provocation! Besides, the abolitionists, so far from having encouraged the slaves to make resistance, or fomented a discontented, uneasy, rebellious spirit among them, have uniformly taught submission to their masters, and a patient endurance of their grievous oppressions. And so far from there being greater danger, of slave rebellions now than formerly, there is doubtless much less. For so long as the slaves know, (and they *do* know,) that their friends are laboring for their emancipation, so long they will be the more peaceable and quiet, than they otherwise would be. Hope always inspires quietness; despair always urges to resistance. Let the present abolition efforts cease entirely, and the danger of servile rebellion will be greatly increased. The spirit of liberty is kindled by nature in the bosoms of the slaves; and they all well know, that it of right belongs to them. This spirit may be smothered for a while; but, unless voluntary emancipation ensue in time, it will at last break out in rebellion like a volcano. It will be impossible to quench this spirit in ignorance, in a country that resounds with the liberties of white men, from one end of it to the other. The plain truth is, the abolition measures are *not* a 'cause,' of any alleged increase of slave cruelties, in any just or proper sense of that word; for they do not 'cause' any *necessity* for such increase, but the reverse; as has been shown. They are made the *occasion*, or wicked *pretence* or pretext, by the slaveholders, to excuse or justify themselves, in wreaking that revenge on their innocent slaves, which they are unable to inflict on their friends the abolitionists. Any pretences will answer the purposes of tyrants, and they always attempt to justify their crimes, by false pretences among other wicked means. Their use of such means, illustrates the maxim stated in the First Lecture, namely, that 'crime can only be supported by crime.' And the stale criminal pretence of all tyrants is, the 'necessity' of committing crimes, to support other crimes committed by themselves, 'caused' by the righteous conduct of their victims or their friends.

I have no doubt but that some few slaveholders, have wreaked their malicious vengeance against the abolitionists, on the persons of their innocent and unoffending slaves. Well authenticated cases of this kind can doubtless be produced. The depraved character of most slaveholders, renders the fact too probable, to need other proof of it. But this dreadful fact, instead of operating to deter abolitionists, from the discharge of their righteous duties, ought to stimulate them to greater efforts and increased zeal, to put a speedy end to such horrors. For when they observe a body of men so excessively wicked, as to punish innocent persons, for the pretended crimes of others, they should redouble their righteous exertions, to deprive them of the power to perpetrate such wickedness.

It is characteristic of tyranny, to persecute the innocent instead of punishing the guilty;—and to punish innocent and meritorious acts, under false pretences. And such persecution is always the clearest proof, that the power which inflicts it is unjust, tyrannical and wicked. Were there no other proof of the utter sinfulness of slavery, the persecutions of the abolitionists and the slaves, 'for righteousness sake,' (Matt. v 10–12,) by the slaveholders and their friends, would be amply sufficient for that purpose. A tree which produces such bad *fruits*, must of course be a *bad tree*; and all the protestations and professions of slaveholders to the contrary, can never disprove the charge. No matter how fair and beautiful the body, bark, limbs, leaves and flowers of a tree may be; if the *fruit* be bad the whole tree is bad. The conduct of Nero, Caligula and Robespierre, was not clearer proof of *their* corruption, than that of

the slaveholders is of theirs.

But the most curious part of the whole subject is, that the objection is raised, out of pretended pity and tenderness to the slaves, by persons only who were never known before, to manifest the least pity, sympathy or indignation, for any slave wrongs or sufferings, except those which they say, the *abolitionists* have caused! Most singular indeed is it, that slave rigors and cruelties should have such a different effect, on such tender, conscientious, sympathetic minds, according only as they are inflicted by different agents. The only portion of their 'southern brethren,' for whom they have any sympathy, is the criminal, tyrannical portion.—For 'those who are in bonds,' they never had any pity or sympathy, or 'bowels of compassion' at all!! Nor do these tender sympathisers advise, or manifest any intention or desire to advise, the slaveholders to abolish slavery and release their victims; which would prevent the 'necessity' af all rigor whatever. They well know, that whether the abolitionists prosecute their measures or not, yet so long as slavery continues, the *necessary* treatment of the slaves must be *cruel*. Yet they manifest no solicitude on account of *this* kind of necessity! They are perfectly willing the colored people should be abused to any extent, provided the *abolitionists* do not abuse them! They care not who else abuses the slaves, if the abolitionists do not! Nor have we the least reason to believe, from their previous conduct, that had the abolitionists never appeared, their sensibilities would ever have been disturbed, by all the slave cruelties in the world. It is only the particular injuries inflicted by the *abolitionists*, that rend their sensitive and virtuous bosoms!

11th Obj.—*Ancient Prophecy.*

This *objection*, if it deserves to be called one, is soon disposed of. It assumes, contrary to all the *evidence* in the case, that all the black people in the world descended from Canaan, who was cursed in his posterity for his father Ham's transgression; and therefore it is *just* and right to enslave them; such conduct being in obedience to prophecy, alias the *express commands* of God. A slight theological error is here perceptible. Prophecies are not Divine commands. They are not the rule of christian duty. They are merely histories of events, related previously to their occurrence. Neither does the fulfilment of prophecies by wicked agents, leave those agents guiltless,—vide Ex. iv 21, vii 3, 13, xiv 4, 17, Deut. xxxi 16–18, 29, Judg. ii 19, Jer. xxv 8–14, Hos. ix 9, Matt. xviii 7, Luke xvii 1, Rom. ix 22, and other passages. For if they were, nobody on predestinarian principles, could be guilty of sin! The bondage of the Israelites was prophecied of, (vide Gen. xv 13, 14;) but yet the Egyptians were punished for it. The sufferings and death of our Saviour were matter of old prophecy; yet the corrupt Jews who crucified him, and their posterity, were held responsible in the most awful penalties, for the guilt of this most criminal transaction. So Christ foretold the persecutions of his own followers, (vide Matt. x 16–23, xxiv 9, 2d Tim. iii 12, &c.;) yet their persecutors were dreadfully scourged for them. Many other similar cases might be cited. Besides, the Scriptures expressly forbid the doing of evil, that good may come of it,—vide Rom. iii 8, vi 1, 15. Let people beware then, how they commit sin, by doing evil that good may come of it, through perverted notions, of the innocent fulfilment of the prophecies.

But the objection is as false in fact as it is in sentiment. The primeval origin of nations is involved in the greatest obscurity; but from all the evidence there is in the case, antiquarians are generally agreed, that the present race of black people, descended from *Cush*, another son of Ham, (Gen. x 6,) upon whom no curse was pronounced. There is no evidence that they descended from *Canaan*. The real descendants of Canaan, upon whom the curse actually fell, were the *Canaanites*, (Gen. x 15–18.) who settled in the 'land of Canaan,' (Gen. x 19, xiii 12–18, xv 13–21, xxvi 3, 4, Ex. xxiii 31, Numb. xxxiv 2–12, &c.) the boundaries of which are well defined in the passages quoted; and which was promised to Abraham and his posterity, after their deliverance from Egyptian bondage; as those passages show. And the prophetic curse pronounced upon Canaan was fulfilled, when his posterity were conquered and subjected by the Israelites; vide Deut. i 7, 8, xi 24, xxxiv 1–4, Josh. i 3, 4, 1st Kings iv 21, Neh.

ix 8, and other passages. The objection thus falls to the ground. There is no more evidence to show, that the negroes descended from *Canaan*, than that the English, French, or other white nations did. The descendants of Canaan could not have been black people, as the complexion of their posterity, supposed to be yet residing in Syria and Palestine, proves.—The zeal of our republican patriots, for the support of slavery, has outstripped their knowledge. They ought to make amends for past blunders, by hunting up Bible prophecy, to justify Irish oppression. Perhaps their sagacity will yet discover, that the Irish, the Greeks, the Poles, and all the white slaves in the world, are descendants of Canaan!

Perversions of the true meaning of the Scriptures, have often been used to justify wicked practices; but a meaner perversion was never made, nor for a wickeder purpose, than the one under consideration. It is a curious fact, that there have always been, since the commencement of authentic history, a far greater number of white, than of black slaves in the world. And it would be just as reasonable, to attribute the lineage of all these white slaves to *Canaan*, as that of all the black ones. It would if possible, be less unreasonable and blasphemous, to argue inversely, and openly declare, that the *condition* of all slaves both white and black, proves them to have descended from Canaan, or Cain, or somebody else, under a prophetic curse, and therefore it is *just* and right to enslave them; for had it not been for this *condition*, the objection would never have been thought of! Had the British government, for instance, conquered and enslaved the colonies during the revolutionary war, it would have had just as good a right to pretend, that *we* were descendants of Canaan, as we have to pretend the colored people are. The one kind of blasphemy is no more absurd and wicked than the other. It is in truth the foundation of the objection. For had it not been for the enslaved *condition* of the colored people, it would not have been necessary to forge perversions to apologize for it. However, as one false pretence or 'refuge of lies,' is just as good as another for so wicked a purpose, we frequently find professing christians who pretend to believe in the Bible, and infidels who do not, but who are united in opposing abolition, resorting to this blasphemous pretence, to justify one of the wickedest of all practices.

12th Obj.—*Impotency of Anti-Slavery Efforts.*

The effect of this objection is shockingly blasphemous; for as Abolition is a part of God's Law, it does in effect deny the ability of the Almighty, to execute His own will! The cause of abolition is the cause of God; and those who deny the possibility of its final triumph over slavery, deny in effect the power of God, to destroy iniquity and establish the reign of righteousness. They also deny the promises of God for that purpose; vide Ps. lxxii 2–17, Isa. xi 4–9, xxxii 15–18, and a thousand others. True it is, that God for purposes mysterious to us, often permits the wicked to flourish long in their iniquities; vide Ps. xxxvii 35, Isa. xiv 13, 14, &c; though their final destruction is sure, as the connexion shows. But none of God's promises can fail of final accomplishment; vide Ps. cii 25–27, Isa. li 6, Matt. xxiv 35, &c. And true it is, that God both in his ordinary and extraordinary providence, in order to mortify and humble human conceit, vanity and pride, frequently works with the most feeble and apparently unlikely means; vide Ps. viii 2, Matt. xi 25, 1st Cor. i 25–29, and other passages; a doctrine most strikingly exemplified, by every moral if not political revolution on record. The original and indeed principal agents of such revolutions, from the prophets and apostles downwards, have generally been poor, obscure men, destitute of property and friends, and having no other weapons but the 'sword of the spirit.' To human appearance, they were among the most feeble and unlikely agents that could be mentioned; and the rise and progress of the great anti-slavery revolution, affords another fine illustration, of the truth of the doctrine; as also of the harmony in it, of the Laws of Nature and Revelation. The appearance of such agents tends to provoke this blasphemous objection; but so long as their *cause* is that of God, it must be highly blasphemous, to apply it either to the cause or its agents. But let us analyze the merits of the objection.

It is one point in the policy of the enemies of abolition, though a most futile one, to endeavor to intimidate and discourage abolitionists, by representing, contrary to the lights of experience and the promises of God, that the attainment of their great object, (the overthrow of slavery,) is impossible. 'No progress' has been made they say, towards abolition in this country as yet; and of course, according to their predictions, none ever will or can be made: so that the enterprise is utterly hopeless and useless. But this is very strange reasoning; for according to it, 'no pro-

gress' was made towards British emancipation, previous to the first of August 1834! All the efforts, labors and sacrifices of the British abolitionists, *previous* to that time, has been ineffectual and useless! So also, in digging a well of fifty feet deep, if water be not found in digging the first forty-nine feet, 'no progress' is made towards finding it. All the *preparations* for emancipation are, it seems, entirely useless, until emancipation actually takes place; and therefore, nobody ought ever to attempt to make any; just as nobody ought ever to attempt to build a house; because such attempt is entirely useless, until the house is completely finished! Yet absurd and ridiculous as this pretence is, it is frequently used.

And on the supposition the pretence is true; if the means used by the abolitionists are so weak, powerless and impotent, as to be *useless*, and produce 'no effect,' and make 'no progress' towards abolition, what becomes of the *pretence* of *danger* from the use of them! The two pretences flatly contradict each other, and cannot therefore both be true. They are in fact both false. But those who use one, would if they were not reprobate, be ashamed to use the other; for consistency's sake. And the principal reason why either is used, is because reprobates are ashamed of nothing.

In the spirit of this pretence is the oft repeated taunt of, 'why don't you go to the *south* and preach abolition? We have no slaves at the north; such preaching is useless *here*' &c. I shall notice this taunt again; but will answer it for the present, by these *inquiries*: How can this be known without trial? Does the analogy of past experience confirm its truth? And why are such unusual criminal efforts made to prevent the trial? Why are the just laws of God and man violated, and the rights of the abolitionists trampled in the dust, to prevent this *northern* preaching? Why all this criminal opposition at the *north*? Why the mobs, the 'indignation meetings,' the buffoonry, scurrility and blasphemy, the executive recommendations, the legislative resolutions, &c. &c., *to prohibit* this 'useless,' impotent, ineffectual preaching? Why all these efforts to stop, to stifle and prevent such preaching at the *north*! Why do the acts of these pretenders, continually contradict their pretences? Let them answer these inquiries if they can.

It is sometimes said, that American slavery is beyond the *power*, or moral influence of the free states, &c. But this is not true. The moral power of the free states *united* against American slavery, would make a total end of it in a few years. There are other kinds of *power*, besides physical and legislative power; and of far more potency and efficacy than either. The moral power of the truth, which is the *Power of God*, is the greatest power men can wield, to effect great revolutions in society. It precedes and regulates and controls, all other kinds of useful power. See the description of it in 2d Cor. x 4, 5. We may observe the truth of this description, in every case, where this power has been skilfully applied. It overthrew the heathen corruptions of the Roman Empire. It overthrew the corruptions of christianity, at the time of the reformation. And wherever it can be skilfully applied, it will overthrow even slavish corruptions. Nothing like it was ever known, to move and influence and control, the conduct and actions of great multitudes of men. And it as potent now as it ever was. Let its influence once thoroughly pervade the free states, and it will soon overthrow slavery in the slave states.

It is certainly true, that with less powerful means than the abolitionists use, to abolish slavery in the United States, so great an enterprise might never be accomplished. But as the same means under less favorable circumstances, have heretofore achieved still greater wonders, discouragement in their present use, would be wholly inexcusable. We know that the simple preaching of genuine christianity, destroyed all the heathen religions and abominations, within the sphere of its influence. And were true christianity in regard to human oppression, to be universally preached now, it would soon destroy modern slavery. This curse can no more stand before the light of gospel truth, than idol worship or any other abomination can. Nor will such preaching in the free states, be ineffectual for such a purpose. Neither Luther nor Knox nor Calvin preached at Rome. Yet the Pope felt the power of their preaching, as much perhaps as if they did. That part of christianity which applies to Human Oppression, has been entirely silenced in all slave countries, because slavery could not exist unless it were silenced; any more than Mahometanism or Paganism could. Genuine christianity always demands light and free examination, (vide Prov. iv 18, &c.–Matt. v 14–16, 1st Thess. v 21.–1st John. 1st 5–7, and other passages;) whereas its perversions and corruptions, as well as all false religions and criminal practices, demand darkness and silence; vide Job xxiv 13–17, Ps. lxxiv 2), Isa. xxix 15, xxx 1, John iii 20, 2d Cor. iv 2, Eph. v 11–13, &c. The Scriptures abundantly teach these doctrines; and the nature of human corruption and its reformation, abundantly confirm their truth, thus proving again also, the harmony of the Laws of Nature and Revelation. All manner of criminal means have been resorted to, even in this enlightened country, to prevent the exhibition of the true doctrines of christianity, in regard to human oppression; because the enemies of liberty know, that if these doctrines *are* preached, in the genuine spirit of christianity, they will destroy slavery. They know that genuine christianity is a system of republican liberty and equality; that it grants and guarantees equal rights to all mankind; and that the more true christianity is preached, the clearer will the truth of this great doctrine appear. Liberty is so necessary a doctrine of christianity, that it is made a type or figure of deliverance from spiritual bondage; vide John viii 32, Rom. v, 14, 18, 22, vii 4, 6, viii 2, 21, 2d Cor. iii 17, Gal. ii 4, iii 28, iv 3, v 1, 1st Pet. ii 16, and numerous

rous other passages. Perfect human liberty, both spiritual and temporal, is the spirit of the whole Scriptures; as a comparison of the numerous passages quoted, and hundreds more that might be quoted, will show. No wonder then, that tyrants, whether spiritual or temporal, should withhold the 'key of knowledge' from their slaves, and endeavor to shroud true christianity in darkness; and that they should cleave to its abuses, perversions and corruptions, as the 'ark of safety' to their slave rights.

It is curious to hear the objection under consideration, made by men, who have heretofore proclaimed the loudest of any, the effects of our republican institutions and example, on the tyrannies of the old countries; proclaiming how those means shake the thrones of the tyrants, cause them to turn pale, &c. Now is it not at least as likely, that the abolition example of the free states, will have as great an influence, on the slave tyrants of the slave states, as the united example of *both* will have, on the tyrants of the old countries! It is strictly true, that our republican example has a powerful influence in Europe; but this influence would be much more powerful and effectual, were not the effect of it neutralized by our practice of slavery. Yet will not the proclamation of the truth here, be likely to produce as great an effect *at home*, as it will in Europe or Asia? Nay, will it not much greater? And how can those corruptionists, who support slavish oppression at home, consistently oppose it abroad; as they are in the constant habit of doing! And why do they not boast of the effect, of abolition example and preaching, at home as well as abroad? Have they less love for liberty in their own, than in foreign countries; or do they regard the rights and happiness of foreigners, less than those of their own countrymen? Or do they desire the liberty and equal rights of *all* men, in foreign countries only! For the constant and consistent 'democratic' practice, of our American 'republicans' is, to contend for freedom abroad, and for slavery at home!

But to return to our course of argument. There is nothing like the exhibition of christian truth, in its simplicity, to remove error, and promote the increase of righteousness and justice. Witness the heathen reformations just quoted; the protestant reformation; the late temperance reformation, and many others. All the genuine liberty in the world, first sprung from genuine christianity; and has ever since been preserved by its influence. And wherever such liberty has been lost, it has been for the want of the protection of *such* christianity. And wherever wicked errors and oppression, have become customary in christian countries, it is because genuine christianity has been rejected, and a false one substituted in its stead. This is the only true reason, of the existence of Human Oppression, in *christian* countries. Slaveholders and other aristocratic tyrants, keep genuine christianity concealed from their victims; and thus contrive to keep them ignorant, oppressed and degraded. The proper means to reform these corruptions, and vindicate and restore true liberty, are therefore plain. It is simply, *to preach the whole gospel*, in its purity and simplicity, without any perversions; as already stated.

The objection under consideration, is as before remarked, blasphemous in its nature. Considering the nature of the means used, to effect an anti-slavery reformation, it does in effect, deny the *Power of God*, to work reformation from sin! And if it were not thus blasphemous, it is contradicted by facts. In every case on record, where the same means now used to abolish slavery, have been thoroughly applied to the removal of wicked customs, they have succeeded. It is only where the application has not been attempted, or where it has been prevented, that they have ever failed; if indeed such want or prevention can be considered a failure. And such has already been their effect, in this very corrupt country, that there can be no reasonable doubt left, of the ultimate extinction of our slavery. As before remarked, the objection is similar to an attempt to discourage the digging of a well; by arguing, that because water cannot be found at the depth of a few feet, no spring can ever be found still lower down. The *argument* is, that because great reformations cannot be effected instantly, therefore they can *never* be effected! The same 'argument' was used against the Erie canal and other great enterprises. Had ancient reformers been discouraged by *such* 'arguments,' no religious or moral reformations would ever have taken place. Christianity itself would have failed; and the world remained involved in heathenish ignorance and immorality. Nay, were such foolery to be always heeded, no new crop would ever be sown; no new house built or other enterprise undertaken. All business would be entirely suspended!

And yet the blasphemous question is often tauntingly put, '*what good* has abolition done?'—'How many slaves has it liberated!' I answer: it has liberated 800,000 in the British West Indies; 600,000 in St, Domingo; 3,000,000, or more, in South America; and false reports and pretences, and other opposition, to the contrary notwithstanding, it has *begun* to liberate, and will with the blessing of God according to His promises, in the course of a few years liberate, 2,500,000, or more slaves, in the United States; and will finally liberate all the slaves, amounting to more than 100,000,000 throughout the world! The 'signs of the times' to this effect, are too plain to be mistaken. The 'fountains of the great deep' of slavery, are beginning to break up; and the deluge of abolition will finally overwhelm it, with utter destruction.

Were none of these 'signs' perceivable, it would be no less the duty of the friends of righteousness, to 'labor and faint not,' for the extirpation of slavery and all other abominations. But ac-

cording to usual indications, there never was a reformation before projected, that had a fairer prospect of ultimate success before it, than that of American Abolition. Reformations of every kind, owing to the facilities of printing and literary communications, operate with vastly greater rapidity, than they formerly did. *And they seldom go backwards.* Their march is onward, with a rapidity proportioned to the means used to accelerate them. The anti-slavery reformation now progresses, with the greatest rapidity and energy. The success of the Erie canal, or any other great project, was not more certain. As the prospect now is, we have the best reason to hope and believe, that within the next succeeding ten years, 'every yoke in the United States will be broken, and all the oppressed go free.'

And it should be remembered, that it is the *enemies* of abolition only, who pretend to despair of its success. Its friends exhibit no signs of discouragement, but the contrary. But the former may dismiss their apprehensions. The cause of God is invincible; and all their wicked opposition will not defeat it. But their perseverance, in the bad cause in which they are engaged, is worthy of imitation, in the good one to which they are opposed. Strange is it, they can see no reason for despair, in a cause opposed to analogy and the promises of God. In the cause of the *devil*, they profess to have confidence; in that of God, none at all! But their 'confidence' is that of despair only; and they persevere in their despair, for the same reason the devil does; to gratify in some way if possible, their habitual hatred and malice, against the truth and righteousness!

13th Obj.—*Bad Motives.*

Christ told his disciples they should be *'blessed,* when men spoke all manner of evil of them *falsely,* for his sake,' (vide Matt. v 10–22;) that is, for the sake of the righteousness he preached and inculcated; vide also 1st Pet. ii 19, iii 14, 16, and many other passages. It is frequently easy, to speak evil of men truly. But it is just as easy, to speak evil of them falsely; because it is as easy to lie, as to tell the truth; but those who speak evil or others falsely, *'for righteousness sake,'* as is every where spoken of by the abolitionists, commit open blasphemy,—vide Mic. ii 2–4, Matt. xi 20–24, Mark ix 42, John viii 44, 45, x 32, 37, 38, Acts xviii 6, 2d Thess. ii 10–12, 2d Tim. iii 8, and numerous other passages. This kind of opposition, or 'speaking evil of the truth,' is what is meant by direct 'blasphemy,' in the Scriptures; as the numerous quotations show. But the blessing promised to those, against whose righteous acts it should be spoken, appertains to the present abolitionists; for their acts are *literally,* every where 'evil spoken of;' and especially their *motives:* 'for righteousness' sake.' But mark the contradictory nature of the charge. Their cause and object, and all the means used to effect it, are *good,* and yet their motives are falsely and mendaciously said to be *bad!* And not a particle of evidence is ever offered, to substantiate these base charges. *Prima facie,* the motives of the abolitionists are good; and without some *proof* to the contrary, to support these criminal charges, those who make them are justly obnoxious, to the charge of the basest calumny. The Bible teaches, that 'the *tree* is known by its fruits;' But the opposers reverse this rule. All the 'fruits' of abolition are good, and only good; as every case of immediate emancipation has shown. Yet its opposers assert, contrary to Scripture and experience, that both its friends and their motives are *bad!* Most of the abolitionists are also men of fair characters, unblemished reputations and exemplary behaviour. Very strong proof will be requisite, to satisfy the virtuous and honest part of community, that the motives of *such* people are bad.

But notwithstanding these facts, the country has rung with the false charges against abolitionists, of *treason, fanaticism, incendiarism, sectarianism, amalgamation, political designs, &c.;*—and with the false and opprobrious epithets of 'traitors,' 'fanatics,' 'radicals,' 'disorganizers,' 'madmen,' &c., all designed to load the abolitionists with hatred and distrust, and all made without the least evidence, or pretence or offer of any, to support them; and by men too, who constantly advocate liberty abroad, and support slavery at home! The enemies of abolition content themselves, with the use of hard names instead of hard arguments. From their total want of good means, they are compelled to use none but bad ones; false charges among the rest. And these epithets are applied to abolitionists, by persons who were never known to charge slaveholders and other real 'fanatics,' &c., with any thing similar; or to manifest any indignation, at their habitual violation of moral duties and human rights. They never charge tyrants with bad motives! It is the enemies of tyranny only, who in their virtuous opinion, are thus chargeable!

It is proper to observe, that even if these charges were true, the fact would form no good objection to abolition itself; because good causes *may be* supported from bad motives; though it is not to be supposed they often are; the nature of every cause being *prima facie* evidence, of the motives by which it is supported. The merits of every institution, enterprise or cause, are entirely distinct and independent, from the motives of those who support it. The one may be good and the other bad; though if the one be good, the other without proof to the contrary, will be presumed good also; and vice versa. Perhaps every good cause has had some bad motives

enlisted in its support; because men support causes from every variety of motive. A case in point occurs in the New Testament, where St. Paul rejoiced, that the gospel was propagated from bad motives, (Phil. i 15–18;) for though he detested the motives, he could but rejoice, that good was brought out of evil. And thus if abolition be right, bad motives cannot make it wrong; and we ought to rejoice, at any good effects they may produce. The honest inquiry still will be, is abolition itself right; and not what are the motives of its supporters; though we ought to condemn them if bad. But as already remarked, since abolition is itself good, without some *proof* of the fact, abolitionists ought not even to be suspected of bad motives.

But the utter falsity of these base charges may be easily proven. *Treason*, for instance, is in legal acceptation, a betraying of one's country to its enemies, by the overt acts described in the laws, provided for the punishment of the crime of treason. It has never been pretended, much less attempted to be proved, that the abolitionists as such, have ever committed treason in *this* sense. They are at least not *legal* 'traitors.' But men may commit *moral* or political treason, in many ways, without incurring the penalties of the laws, of their respective countries. All, for instance, who introduce, propagate and encourage, vicious habits and customs, that tend to demoralize, degrade and weaken their country, are moral and political traitors; and are frequently more mischievous than legal ones. They are a very numerous class; and history abounds with accounts of them; and the world is as full of them now as it ever was. All tyrants are traitors of this class; and slaveholders most of all. So are all legislators who make bad, arbitrary, tyrannical, oppressive and vexatious laws. The highest ranks of society, abound with them; men being in general wicked, in proportion to their elevation in the scale of society. Of all men in the United States, slaveholders are as a class, the greatest moral and political traitors to their country. They have done more than all other classes put together, to divide, impoverish, vex, weaken, demoralize, degrade and ruin their country. They are genuine moral and political traitors; and those who support them in their slave rights and practices, are of the same description. A moral and political *patriot* on the other hand, is one who endeavors to support, unite, enrich and happify his country, not only by means of just laws, customs and measures, but by attacking and destroying bad laws, customs, institutions, practices and measures. In this true and correct sense, the American abolitionists, are a band of genuine patriots, united to save their country, from the certain ruin impending over it, from the insidious agency of the moral treason of slavery. But every real patriot, is a traitor to *tyranny* and *vice*. He could not be a real patriot unless he were. In this sense, abolition may truly be said, to be moral treason to *slavery*;—and of course, the abolition 'traitors' who propagate it, do according to the sentiment of Patrick Henry, yield 'obedience to God.' And that they actually do so, no honest well informed person will doubt. No persons ever gave stronger proofs than they, of their ardent patriotism and devotion to the true good of their country. A *real* friend to his country is one, who endeavors to promote its safety and prosperity, by the use of just and honest means; and by removing whatever prevents such safety and prosperity, by the use of the same means. On the other hand, a real enemy to his country is one, who endeavors to expose it to danger and ruin, by unjust and wicked means; and by nourishing and protecting, the causes of such danger and ruin, by the same means. A friend to slavery can never be a true friend to his country; because slavery is the greatest curse, to every country that harbors it. Tried by these unerring rules, the abolitionists are readily distinguished, as the only real friends, and their opposers as the only real enemies of their country.

A *fanatic* is one whose conduct is wild, irregular and inconsistent: and sometimes vicious, cruel and ferocious, in consequence of the adoption, of *false and erroneous principles*, which are frequently united, with wicked and destructive *practices*. This is an exact delineation, of the character of slaveholders and other corruptionists, who are in general, all real fanatics. But until it can be proven, that the principles of the abolitionists are *false*, and their conduct wicked and destructive of happiness, it is false to charge them with 'fanaticism.' Until this is done, it would be as false to call our Saviour, the prophets, apostles, and other reformers, 'fanatics,' as to call the abolitionists such. Sharpe, Clarkson, Wilberforce, and the other leading British Abolitionists, were called 'fanatics,' &c. by their enemies, for forty years or more; while during all that time, those very enemies were the only real fanatics engaged in the contest. The plain proof of their fanaticism appeared in the falsehoods and false predictions, they continually uttered respecting abolition; such for instance as that, 'abolition would deluge the West Indies with blood and carnage,' that it would 'ruin the commerce of the British empire,' &c.; exhibiting at the same time, the most ferocious and wicked conduct; while the abolitionists, perfectly free from all fanatical delusion or deception, spoke nothing but words of 'truth and soberness.' So men who like our slaveholders, advocate liberty abroad and oppose it at home, thus preferring the rights and happiness of foreigners to those of their own countrymen, are not only hypocrites, but fanatics. None perhaps are so apt, to charge 'fanaticism' and the like on others, as those who are the most guilty of them. Such false charges are a common policy, of all real fanatics and corruptionists, in order to cast odium on their opposers; for the same reason that the real incendiary, is generally the first to cry 'fire,' or the thief to cry 'stop thief,' in order to escape suspicion and avoid detection. It is an old trick of such corruptionists; vide Luke xxiii 2, Acts vi

13, xvi 20, xvii 6, 7, xxi 28, xxiv 5, 2d Pet. ii 12, 15. And the evidence of the trick is, that *they* never offer any proof, of the truth of their scandalous charges; simply because they never have any to offer. And the proof is also clear, that the enemies of abolition are all real fanatics. For their anti-abolition principles and practice are in the highest degree false, erroneous, blasphemous and wicked, as has been demonstrated a thousand times over. As was remarked in the First Lecture, they have not been able to move against abolition, without committing sins of some kind; without the use of scurrility, sophistry, falsehood, unlawful fanatical violence, and other wicked means. Neither have they been able, to practice or defend slavery a moment, without the use of the same means. They are therefore all real fanatics: as the Jews who persecuted the christians were; and as all other opposers of the truth and righteousness have been; and for the same reason, namely, the falsity and wickedness of their principles and practice.

None but real fanatics ever make and persist in false charges. And as a specimen of genuine fanaticism, I will quote the false and slanderous charge, so currently made against the abolitionists, of *instigating* mobs and mob violence and outrage. For when and where I ask, have the abolitionists ever aided, abetted, advised, encouraged or practised mob violence; or given the least *just* provocation for it! The *evidence* is notoriously the other way. The abolitionists are emphatically men of peace, and lovers of good law and order; so much so, that they have seldom used, even defensive force against unlawful violence; although the laws permitted it; choosing according to the Divine precept, 'to suffer rather than do wrong.' That their lawful acts and measures, have been made the *occasion*, or wicked *pretext*, of mob violence, does not prove such occasion or pretext, to have been *just* or reasonable; or that those acts and measures were *unjust*, unlawful or improper. For if it did, the most innocent and meritorious acts that righteous men can perform, may at any time be perverted by wicked men, into *just* 'causes' of violence and outrage! Nay, any pretence that any criminal at the bar may set up, is a good defence for him! The truth is, no acts of righteousness, justice, mercy or duty, no good and lawful deeds whatever, can justly be tortured or perverted, into justifications of crime; for how can any virtue, *justify* its opposite, or any other vice? And it is certain, that the abolitionists as such, have never performed any but such acts and deeds. And to use them as a pretext for crime, only increases the guilt and enormity of the crime; vide Matt. xxiii 31, 32, 35, and many other passages. The abolitionists have done nothing more, than proclaim the 'truth in righteousness'; which cannot be a *just* provocation to crime; because all men are specially commanded by the Almighty, to make such proclamation every where; vide Isa. lviii 1, and other passages. They have done, just as our Saviour and his followers did before them. This is the 'provocation,' and the only provocation, the abolitionists have given for mob violence and outrage. The charge that *they* have instigated, or caused mobs, &c., is therefore a false and 'fanatical' charge.

A *righteous zeal* for the truth and righteousness, is *not* 'fanaticism'; and none but real fanatics will ever call it such. The test of any kind of zeal is its fruits. A fanatical zeal always produces bad fruits, or effects and consequences. But if these fruits be righteousness, justice, peace, prosperity, and every other good effect, as all abolition fruits are, it is a righteous and holy zeal; and as such ought to be cultivated and improved, till all its holy and happy effects appear. Perseverance in such zeal is a plain christian duty; vide Ps. lxix 9, Matt x 22, xxiv 13, 1st Cor. xiii 7, xv 58, 2d Cor. vii 11, ix 2, Eph. ii 10, Tit. ii 14, iii 8, Heb. vi 15, and numerous other passages. The false imputation to *such* zeal therefore, of fanaticism, and other wickedness, with a design to discourage and allay it, is conduct highly 'fanatical,' blasphemous and criminal. So is likewise the false charge, of 'hard language'; or the calling of crimes like slaveholding, by their right names, such as 'manstealing,' 'robbery,' &c. as the Bible always does; such conduct being plain scriptural duty. It is the right and proper *use* of language, by the abolitionists, in reference to slavery, and not their abuse of it, that enrages the enemies of righteousness in this country. It is never an 'abuse' of language, to call things by their right names.

A *disorganizer* is one, who violates good laws and customs, and produces unlawful violence and disorder, for bad purposes. The enemies of abolition are all real 'disorganizers'; for as has been remarked, they have frequently broken the just laws of God and man, for the wicked purpose of defeating the righteous work of abolition. But the abolitionists have violated no just laws. They have been emphatically law abiding people. Nor are they justly obnoxious to the charge of treason, either legal or moral. Their ultimate object is, to prevent rebellion and a dissolution of the union, by removing the only real cause, that threatens those calamities—slavery. But many of their enemies are justly obnoxious to the charge; because they actually threaten treason; and because they support slavery, a practise that finally 'disorganizes' and ruins every country that tolerates it. They threaten to dissolve the union, if the abolitionists are not silenced; which is a treasonable threat. The abolitionists have used no such threat; nor have they given any body else, any just provocation to use it, unless works of righteousness, performed in a just and legal manner, are such a provocation! Nor is there the least danger of treason from any body, except the slaveholders and their supporters; nor probably of any but *threatened* treason, even from them; as will be explained hereafter.

So the abolitionists have been charged by their enemies, with *want of patriotism*: the meaning of which is, a want of acquiescence and zeal in the support of slavery, and other abomina-

tians that disgrace and ruin the country. Patriotism was formerly considered as zeal for *liberty*. But in republican America, the rule is by many reversed; and 'patriotism' with them, means zeal for the support of *slavery!* Beautiful 'patriots' these, who contend for liberty abroad, and fight for slavery at home! Admirable 'democrats' those, who approbate such conduct! True it is, that the abolitionists do not profess, *that kind* of 'patriotism,' which supports, tolerates or connives at slavery. Nor do they love the vices and crimes of their country. They could not be real patriots, and would be traitors to its best interests, if they did. And because they hate and oppose and expose, those vices and crimes faithfully, they are the only true and faithful friends the country has. A real enemy, *a traitor*, would foster and encourage those evils; as the slaveholders and their supporters actually do; to the ruin of the country. A person who by righteous and peaceful reformation, endeavors to save his country from ruin, is a true patriot: and those who oppose such reforms, as the slaveholders and their friends do, are the real enemies of their country. They are the only citizens who lack true patriotism.

So the colored people have been falsely charged, with *want of love* to their native country;—and by persons who have done every thing in their power, to cause them to hate it. Were the charge true, the white people have no right to make it; for who but themselves have caused this want? Criminals have no right, to charge the effects of their own crimes, on their victims; though nothing is more common than for them to do it. But the charge is not true. The love of country is instinctive; and though we may well suppose, that the colored people do not love the *oppressions* of their native land; yet notwithstanding all the abuse and cruelty they have constantly endured, their conduct, both in peace and war, has proven, that their love for their most unnatural and barbarous parent, is yet as strong as that of other natives. The utmost degree of oppression and wrong, has not been able entirely to extinguish it. The charge is falsely directed. It is their enemies and not they, that lack real patriotic 'love' for their country.

Many preach and practice the doctrine, of *contentment*, with the laws, customs and institutions of one's country, be the same good or bad, 'right or wrong'; and call such conduct *'patriotism.'* Such preachers ought never to attempt, to produce discontent, among the subjects of other countries. Nor ought they ever to attempt reforms in such countries, even from infidelity or heathenism; for the subjects of those countries, in order to be 'patriots,' ought to be *'contented,'* with their own laws and customs, however wicked and destructive they may be! Notwithstanding the express commands of God to the contrary, they ought to violate or neglect those commands, by refusing to reform customary sins; because they cannot be *patriots* unless they do! Such is the blasphemous nature, of this kind of 'patriotism,' so common in all parts of the United States. With those who practice it, none but 'vicars of Bray' can be real 'patriots.' But I do not know of a more vicious and dangerous heresy; for if enough of its professors can be found, demagogues and other corruptionists, might ruin a country at any time. It is also highly blasphemous; for the effect of it is, to charge the Saviour and all his followers, with want of patriotism; and to justify neglect and disobedience to the Divine commands! It is by the patriotic acts of *discontented* men only, that the moral corruptions of countries have been reformed, and their liberties, rights and independence thus preserved. It was their discontentment, that has ever made men distinguished patriots. Contented acquiescence in the corruptions of a country, is the strongest mark of national moral corruption: not only from the light of Nature but of Scripture; vide Isa. v 18-24, Eze. xii 27, Hos. vi 9, Amos vi 1, 3, &c. The 'contentment' of robbers, pirates, assassins, and other criminals in their vocations, is not a stronger proof of moral degeneracy and corruption. Still corruptionists of this kind abound, to stigmatize and denounce all as bad citizens, who seem uneasy and indignant, at the corruptions, oppressions and abuses, they witness. The very same conduct, that has formerly made so many famous patriots, now makes men traitors and bad citizens! So much have our national corruptions, perverted the national sentiment! Aristocrats always preach this doctrine, of corrupt 'contentment,' in order to hold up reformers to public odium: and to shield and protect their own usurpations. And if those only are patriots, who are satisfied with the existing corrupt institutions, customs and oppressions, of their respective countries, and those only traitors who are not; then are aristocrats, oppressors, and other tyrants and their tools, the only true patriots; and all reformers traitors. Then were George 3d, and the tories patriots, and Washington, Franklin, and the other revolutionary whigs, traitors. Then were the Pope and his tools, patriots, and Luther and his associates, traitors. Nay, then were the Scribes and Pharisees, the Sanhedrim and the Roman Government, patriots; and the Saviour, the prophets, apostles, martyrs, and other reformers since, all traitors! The absurd and blasphemous consequences of the doctrine, show its falsity and dangerous tendency clearly.

I observed in the First Lecture, that the Scriptures direct us to judge of men's hearts or *motives*, by their fruits or *actions;* and that such is the rule of the common law. In the light of this only correct rule, no motives can be better than those of the abolitionists; because no *works* or actions can be better than theirs. This fact shows, that all the base and scandalous charges, brought against abolitionists, must necessarily be false charges; for these charges are not of such common imperfections, as must necessarily attend every human enterprise or agency, however good it may be in itself; but of the foulest crimes and wickedest motives. And the application:

of the same rule, to the conduct of their enemies will show, that the same charges are applicable, and only justly applicable, to *them*. Test characters by conduct, (the only true and sure test,) and the justice of these applications will clearly appear.

The charges of *sectarianism* and *party* designs, are equally groundless and false. The disposition to raise false and trifling objections, to measures of salutary reform, is a strong sign of moral corruption; being good evidence of a wicked disposition to raise criminal opposition to the truth, on fictitious grounds and false pretences. Yet strange as it may seem, they are frequently raised, by the loudest pretenders to republican virtue, fair opposition, free discussion, &c. These same objections were raised, against the temperance and other reformations. And it should be constantly borne in mind, that those who make these charges, never offer to *prove* them. I have known some opposers, who for want of proof, alleged as such, to support the charge of 'sectarianism,' that presbyterians meddled with abolition. But these pretenders never undertake, to show any connexion between abolition and the *sectarianism* of presbyterians; for in truth there is none; any more than there is between abolition and the peculiar tenets of any other sect.—Between *christianity* and abolition there is the closest connexion; the latter being a plain and most important doctrine of the former; as was shewn in the First Lecture. But abolition has not the slightest connexion, with the peculiar or *sectarian* tenets, of any christian sect that I know of; no more than the doctrines of the Creation, the Fall of Man, or any other great leading doctrines, in which all the sects agree, are. The doctrine of immediate abolition, belongs to all the sects in common; and has therefore nothing sectarian in its nature. Certainly they *ought* to hold the great doctrine of the Abolition of Human Oppression, in common; and were any sect to reject it, such rejection would be sufficient proof of its reprobation; vide Jer. vi 14, xxiii 15–17, Zech. xiii 3, Mal. iii 5, Matt. vii 21–23, xxi 13, Rom. i 18, ii 23, Col. iii 25, Rev. xviii 13, and numerous other passages. If any sect do not hold this doctrine, it is a reprobate sect; and God will disown it. But if the objectors mean to be understood, that every thing presbyterians or other sectarians do, is done with reference to sectarian effect, and to promote sectarian influence, then all sectarians must stop working and eating and drinking, to please such reasonable objectors! Presbyterians and other sectarians, work in all manner of lawful and honest employments; but is there any thing *sectarian* in these employments; in farming, blacksmithing, and tailoring, for instance! And is a man to be justly suspected of *party* deigns, because he or his sect follows them! Yet such foolery is just as reasonable, as the ascription of such objects, to abolition action. The whole of these employments *may be* used for sectarian or party effect; but honest men are not to be suspected of such use, without some proof of it. A person who favors abolition, is prima facie to be suspected of *christianity*, I admit; but not of sectarianism.—Besides, what shall be said of infidel abolitionists, and of that class of abolitionists, who pretend to believe in christianity, but embrace it not by public profession? Are these also to be suspected? Are these also to be suspected of sectarian designs! And are the presbyterians more to be suspected, than the quakers and the covenanters and seceders, who are said to be all abolitionists? And why are not the other sects jealous of the presbyterians? And how easily might they, if they are really jealous, that the presbyterians will forestal the sectarian market, by means of abolition, anticipate and frustrate their intention, by turning abolitionists themselves! *And how easily may all other objectors do the same!* Who hinders them from so doing? They ought to know, that there are more ways than one, to check sectarianism, without the use of falsehood for that purpose. Furthermore, no sect is to be suspected, on account of its attachment to abolition; because the abolition project has the greatest *anti*-sectarian influence, of any benevolent enterprise, ever undertaken in this country. This effect can plainly be observed, in abolition assemblies. During the whole time of their sessions, it seems to unite the sentiments of all the religious sects present, into one religious feeling. As abolitionists, they are 'all of one accord," all brother christians together. They are all agreed, in the duty of the immediate abolition of slavery; and of their high obligation to labor for it; a circumstance that leaves it to be hoped, they will become united, against other abominations in the land. The reason why so large a proportion of the abolitionists are *professors of religion*, is because the cause takes fast hold of their *consciences*; which are generally more enlightened than those of their neighbors. They are convicted of the *sinfulness* of slavery. Men become abolitionists, exactly in proportion, as they are conscientious enlightened christians. And it is extremely difficult for me to comprehend, how a *real* believer in christianity, can be other than an abolitionist; so exceedingly plain and clear do I view to be, the Bible doctrine of the sinfulness of slavery.

As to the *political* bearings of abolition; it is clearly true, that it is a political as well as religious enterprise. Slavery cannot be directly abolished, without political action, any more than murder and other crimes can; the enactment of laws being a species of political action. And this kind of 'political action' must be right, if the abolition of slavery is right; because it must be right, to exercise political as well as moral action, to establish justice and righteousness. Besides, every kind of moral and religious agency in the world, must necessarily have *some* political agency, bearing or influence. All modes of such agency known, such as christianity, religion, freemasonry, sectarianism, infidelity, &c. &c. necessarily must and do have some such tendency. All these various matters must and will, in a variety of ways, affect even party pol-

tates, and carry an indirect if not direct influence to the polls. But must all benevolent enterpri es be suspended & abandoned, on account of this tendency in them! Must vice, licentiousness, slavery and other corruptions, be suffered to exist unheeded and unchecked, because opposition to them may assume a political aspect, or have a political bearing! Must christian duty be neglected, christian morality never be preached, sin never be rebuked, and God's commands be disobeyed, because obedience to them may affect the polls! Surely the objectors cannot insist on the adoption of such ridiculous absurdities, for such blasphemous reasons.

Political means are good in themselves, for they have been *proved* to be such, (1st Thess. v 21,) though they are often shamefully abused for bad purposes; and those who use them properly, for *any* good purposes, are so far commendable; and nothing ought ever to deter honest and good men from using them for *all* good, just and righteous purposes, to the promotion of which they are applicable. Especially when knaves combine, in the use or rather abuse of them, for the support of injustice and oppression, ought honest men to counteract such abuse, by the righteous use of the same means. Every kind of political means is resorted to, for the support of slavery, and the hindrance of its abolition; and yet the friends of the latter cannot resort, to the use of the same means, to resist and counteract this corruption, without being told, that 'slavery is a political thing with which they have nothing to do;' just as if righteousness ought not to be supported at the polls! The political as well as other opposers of abolition, are all real defenders of slavery; and all their sophistical denials and disclaimers, cannot refute the charge; because such is the *effect* of their opposition; and they know it. If a fortress is besieged, those who attack the besieging army, whether from within or without, do so, for the sake of defending and preserving the fortress; just as the opposers of abolition attack it, to preserve slavery. And as they abuse good means for this wicked purpose; as they, for instance, support sin at the polls; why is it not right for their antagonists, to use the same means, to resist their iniquitous intentions? If it be wrong to support sin (slavery) at the polls, it must be right to support righteousness (abolition) there. We are expressly commanded to 'hold fast,' to *all* things 'proven to be good'; or in other words, to use them for good purposes. Let not then abolitionists be deceived, by the sophistical cunning of unprincipled demagogues, who would try to persuade their simplicity, that it is only agreeable to 'republican principles' and 'democratic usages,' to support sin at the polls, but not righteousness; and that none but themselves and others like them, engaged in the scramble for official power, patronage and profit, ought to direct *what* principles, measures and men, shall be supported at the polls! The truth is, every good object ought to be supported, and every bad one attacked there; and those who advocate their respective objects, ought to share their fate at the polls, as well as elsewhere. Let abolitionists understand these Divine principles well, and practice them at the polls; for their own safety, as well as duty, requires it.—No political object can be better than the overthrow of slavery; nor can a better motive impel men to political action; nor was such action ever more necessary or proper in any other good cause. Yet many supporters of slavery persist in asserting, that public office, patronage, power and profit, are designed as the great *end*, instead of a subordinate *means*, of political action, in the great anti-slavery contest. Without the shadow of evidence or the offer of any, to support the charge, they represent these as the principal objects of all the anti-slavery exertions and sacrifices now making. And the very persons who make the false charge, are generally among the most active political opposers of abolition! This stale falsehood is however now so threadbare, as not to work material injury to the righteous cause.

Besides, who can support candidates for office that are advocates of slavery, without supporting sin at the polls? I put this inquiry to all readers; but make a particular reference of it to abolitionists; to persons who profess to be fully sensible of the wickedness of slavery, and of the righteousness of its abolition. Every bad principle, practice, doctrine, custom, or *candidate for office*, ought to opposed every where; and will be thus opposed by honest men; and as well at the polls as elsewhere. And how can any supporter of slavery, either directly or indirectly, be thus far, any thing else but a bad man? His *principles* and motives must be bad, if slavery is bad and its abolition good. How then can any enlightened abolitionist support him at the polls; especially for any legislative office, without committing sin? I confess I do not see how. I make this close and searching reference, in order to induce professed a-

bolitionists, to *act* consistently with their own professed principles; and as well at the polls as elsewhere.

But the charge of *party* political designs, for mere *party* purposes, made against the abolitionists, is contemptibly false. That the abolition project is destined to have a powerful influence at the polls, there can be no doubt. Its enemies have already driven it thither, in its own self defence; and were not this the fact, its own righteous merits, entitle it to such influence. Never was a righteous project more deserving of political, as well as other just support. So great an enterprise also, must be expected to have this necessary effect. Its indirect political effect, is already considerable, and evidently increasing. But we need not argue its political or moral merits again, to secure its political favor. Its *enemies* have already driven it to the polls. They have directly used political power, to crush the cause if possible.—The treatment also which the abolitionists have received, from the national and several state legislatures, in the contemptuous and unconstitutional rejection of their petitions, as well as other legislative insult and abuse, have produced the necessity, of a stern and determined resort to the polls, as the only redress for such gross outrages, on their constitutional rights.—But it is presumed, that nothing like an abolition 'party' in politics, by that or any similar name, will ever be organized in this country, unless the enemies of abolition, produce the necessity for it. An anti-abolition party in politics, might raise an abolition party. But the abolitionists as such, have never designed to form a separate political party, for party as well as other purposes, as the antimasons did. They have adopted as they believe, a far wiser and better policy. They design to abolitionize all the existing parties in the country, to such a degree, that each shall be equally interested, to nominate and elect abolition candidates for office, *so far as may be necessary to abolish slavery;* but no farther. As abolitionists, they will vote without reference to party or party spirit, *except for this one purpose.* And as soon as this purpose is accomplished; as soon as slavery is totally abolished, all the abolition societies and combinations will be dissolved, and abolition efforts and sacrifices ended. No conduct can be more just, fair and honorable, towards all the parties in the country, than this course of political action. For one consequence of it will be, that no party will have any reason to complain of any body, *unless it be of itself.* Nothing at the same time can be more politic. For as soon as it becomes for the *interest* of every party, (as this policy will soon make it,) to elect abolition candidates, for the *sake* of abolition, slavery will soon be abolished. Could this policy have free and unrestrained operation, in each of the states, slavery could not resist it five years, in any of them! Slavery cannot endure its free 'agitation,' in any way; and less in this than in most ways. The free battery of the 'polls' would soon level it to the ground. Considerable time must elapse, before a political abolition interest can be permanently established; but it will at length succeed; and then will commence the legal downfall of slavery. Its moral downfall will lead the way to its political; and the latter to its legal downfall. A comparatively short period, will then only be necessary, for its total annihilation. I have been anxious, to have the *political* designs of the abolitionists, correctly understood, so far as I am acquainted with them, because such unwearied pains are taken by their unprincipled enemies, to mislead the public in regard to them. I have before stated, that we ought to use *all* just, legal, peaceable and christian means, for the overthrow of slavery. And I know of none more justly entitled to be called such, than the political measures and policy just detailed.

To a well informed and conscientious abolitionist, most of the great objects of political controversy in this country, will appear insignificant, in comparison of the great and righteous measure of the abolition of American slavery. I make this remark here, in order to induce such persons, to *act*, consistently with such views and feelings, at the polls. Where all the candidates are favorable to the great cause, and will *act* in its favor, in their official capacity, such persons may then consistently indulge their respective party predilections. But where some of the candidates are favorable and others are not, they ought in every case, to vote for the former; without reference to party or party spirit. Otherwise they will act contrary to the dictates of an enlightened conscience, and therefore have reason to fear that they

have made a sinful preference of men and measures. None of the ordinary objects of party strife, have any Scriptural authority or Divine obligation, in comparison of the abolition of Human Oppression. And the Law of Nature demonstrated by human experience, corroborates the same doctrine. Every political object ought to be supported according to its *Divine Importance*. Let the enemies of Human Oppression beware then, how they sin against Divine light and knowledge, by a preference at the polls, of political objects, of small importance in comparison of abolition.

And it is worthy of remark also, that most opposers exclaim against introducing abolition into politics; but not colonization. Political and legislative action have both been resorted to, for the benefit of the latter; and are yet eagerly resorted to, without any complaint from the enemies of abolition. Slavery too is a political institution; and has always been supported by political means, of every description; and is now supported, both directly and indirectly, at the polls. Yet this is never made any objection to it. But if its *abolition* be proposed to be supported, by the same means, the case is entirely altered. The demagogue clamor of 'union of church and state,' 'dissolution of the union,' 'meddling with none of our business,' &c. is instantly raised; the meaning of which is, that it is right to support *sin* at the polls, but not its opposite righteousness! This is the political morality and 'democracy,' of the enemies of abolition!

But the strangest part of the subject is, that no fault is ever found, by these scrupulous and conscientious objectors, with the avowed motives of slaveholders and others, for their violations of the constitution, and threats of dissolving the union,—vide Prov. xxviii 4. They have the strongest solicitude about the motives of abolitionists; but none at all about those of men stealers! And *such* motives too! Think of this; *exhortations to repentance and works of righteousness*, set up as an apology for threats of treason! *Obedience to the commands of God*, offered as the only motive, for the most flagrant violations of constitutional and Divine rights, by the greatest of crimes! *Peaceable, lawful and christian efforts, to abolish wicked customs*, made the only treasonable pretext, for dissolving the union; for the slaveholders threaten this treason, simply because the abolitionists will obey the commands of God! *Taking the part of the poor, the needy, the afflicted, the oppressed, and those 'that have no helper,'* made the meritorious cause of tyranny and treason both! *Proclaiming the whole gospel, for the benefit of our countrymen, involved in heathenish ignorance and darkness*, made the sole motive for treating *them*, tho' entirely innocent of the accusation, with still greater severity! Most criminals, whenever they attempt to justify or excuse their crimes, commonly pretend, to injuries received from their victims. They merely endeavor to show, that they have only returned evil for evil. But the slaveholders with an effrontery, which nothing but lives spent in crime could produce, make a merit of returning, the greatest evil for the greatest good! That the slaveholders are wicked enough, to commit treason or any other crime, if they dared, is manifest on their own showing. But it requires the utmost hardihood in crime, to avow such *motives* for it. Very seldom do the greatest criminals exhibit such hardihood. The slaveholders may well boast, of having reached the highest degree of perfection in wickedness. But their sympathising admirers in the northern states, can see nothing in *such* motives, but 'high souled honor,' 'nobleness,' 'southern generosity,' 'chivalry,' &c.!! They never think of imputing any thing criminal to *these* motives!

14th Obj.—*Amalgamation.*

Multitudes of white people manifest the strongest pretended abhorrence, at the imaginary prospect, of a legal amalgamation of color, between the white and black races, as the consequence of abolition, who never yet showed the slightest uneasiness, on account of the monstrous *illegal* amalgamation, that has constantly prevailed in the slave states. More than half the slaves it is said, share the blood and color of the whites; yet these alarmists ever have until lately, been perfectly satisfied with the abominable process, which produced the mixture.—Of legal amalgamation they have the utmost horror; in illegal compulsory amalgamation, the

utmost complacency! Slave amalgamation they love; free amalgamation they dread and abhor! They have been perfectly composed, over the universal concubinage of the slaves, the compulsory prostitution of colored females, and the other pollutions and horrors of slavery.—But if the honest marriage of the whites and blacks be spoken of, their alarm is roused to the highest pitch. It is such marriage, and not amalgamation, that these patriots fear; for they have no objections to the latter, provided it be the result of adultery and fornication and not of marriage!! Nay, many who have practiced amalgamation the most, now seem to be the most afraid of it! They fear the general prevalence of a practice, which they themselves follow and support! Even slaveholders and other southern whites, through whose licentious and tyrannical agency, the southern states have been stocked with mulatto slaves, now pretend to be horribly afraid of amalgamation; and their virtuous northern apologists and admirers share the panic. Their virtuous northern advocates, who have always looked complacently and approvingly, on the amalgamating abominations of the south, are now filled with consternation, at the same alarming prospect! They well know, that slavery has a hundred fold the tendency, to produce amalgamation, that liberty has; yet these pinks of moral purity and consistency, who never did nor ever will fear that effect, from the former, pretend ro be horrified at the prospect of it, from the latter cause. They are extremely anxious for the preservation of slavery, the principal guilty cause of the much feared evil, and equally anxious to prevent its abolition, which will do more than any thing else, to prevent the evil feared! Such a corrupt and degraded state of public sentiment, is a greater shame and disgrace to this country, than any degree of legal amalgamation possibly can be.

In most parts of the slave states, the licentiousness of the white males is nearly universal; most of them living in habits of sexual intercourse with female slaves; and the greatest solicitude is often manifested, to have the 'breeding wenches,' as they are called, (many of whom are the offspring of the slaveholders,) produce mulatto children; mulattoes being generally the most marketable slaves. As much solicitude is felt on this important point, as is felt respecting the breeding of brute females; and for the same reason, namely, to increase the value of the marketable slave stock. The female increase of this beastly process, reared for purposes of prostitution, frequently command extravagant prices; and a regular market for this infernal purpose, is held at New Orleans and other places. This brutal process is carried on with very little concealment; and is openly admitted and boasted of, by the traffickers in human flesh and happiness. The colored women being without any protection, are obliged to submit to this hellish treatment without murmuring; and they are punished with the most barbarous cruelty, if they resist or resent it. Yet many opposers of abolition at the north, with a full knowledge of these abominations, profess to be horrified at the prospect of the former, *through fear of amalgamation!!!*

And it is curious to hear these corruptionists contradict themselves. They pretend there is so strong a natural antipathy between the two races, that the white cannot respect the rights of the black race; and yet they fear their amalgamation! They say, this dislike and repugnance is so great, that they never *can* amalgamate, and yet that they inevitably *will* amalgamate, if the blacks are allowed equal rights! According to their declarations, they have no more reason to fear an amalgamation of fire and water, than of the whites and blacks, under *any* circumstances; and yet contrary to reason of their own showing, they pretend to fear it! The contemptible hypocrisy of this pretended fear, is plain and evident. Had it been real, the alarm would have been sounded long ago. The fact that no such alarm was ever heard of, at the forced amalgamation rapidly progressing in the slave states, to a prodigious extent, during the period of one hundred and fifty years, *so long as the offspring of that amalgamation were securely enslaved*, leads us to presume, that no such alarm would ever have been raised, if *the liberty and rights of the slaves had not been agitated.* The beastly process of southern *slave* amalgamation, might have gone on, till there was not a drop of pure white blood left in the slave states, and not one of the present amalgamation alarmists would have murmured; because they love amalgamation for its own sake, provided it is united with slavery! The customary ravishment and prostitution of colored women, in those states, might have progressed

to the end of time; and had not the enslaved *condition* of these women, and their offspring been disturbed, not one of these reprobates would have objected. These facts show, that it is not any mixture of blood; but *freedom*, that these corruptionists fear. They fear an amalgamation of liberty and rights; not that of color.

The *morality* of the objection is this. That on account of the apprehended probability, of a small additional amount of amalgamation, in the free states, in case of a general emancipation, we ought to consent to the perpetuity, of the bloody system of slavery in the slave states, though God has commanded us to attack and abolish it; that is, that we ought to prefer and support a real evil, of the greatest magnitude and most dangerous tendency, in order to prevent an imaginary evil, of trifling importance, even if it were real, though we violate the commands of God thereby; and further, that people ought to remain deprived of all the rights which God has given them, for fear they may offend the taste of other people, (and though they do not violate His Law by such offence,) if those rights are restored to them, as God has commanded!! This is the moral consistency, of the amalgamation objectors to abolition. And if this be not 'straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel,' what is? And is such 'morality' consistent with the profession of genuine democracy and christianity? Surely it is not, unless the basest hypocrisy is consistent with them.

So, many pretend, that the free blacks are a curse to the country; who would never have said so, *if their presence did not disturb the repose of slavery.* Many, if not all these pretenders, well know, that the great mass of the slaveholders, have no intention of parting with their slaves. It is the 'free' blacks only they wish to be rid of. And to get rid of them, they have provided Liberia, as a 'drain' to the free negroes, *for the purpose of securing slavery and amalgamation at home.* They consider the presence of *slaves* here, and their necessary amalgamation, a 'practical blessing'; as they now openly avow. Before the present abolition excitement had made much progress, they affected to lament slavery, as their 'misfortune,' which they could not get rid of, because it was 'entailed' on them; but since the formidable increase of that excitement, the tune is entirely changed; and slavery is *now* a 'practical blessing!' And I wonder how any enlightened person, can consider the settlement of colored people on this continent, *in a state of republican liberty, equality, knowledge and civilization,* to be any thing else but a real 'blessing.' For I suspect more white people can exist on the continent, *with* than without its present black population. The hot countries of this continent can never be cultivated by white labor. The climates of those countries will never permit it; and the slaveholders know it well. Negro slaves were first imported into this country, for this very reason; and negroes will always remain in it, for the same reason. So for the same reason, black slaves were introduced into the West Indies and South America. So long as those countries are cultivated at all, they must be cultivated by black labor. And it is not black labor; but *slave* labor, that curses them. Free, well paid black labor, would make all those countries earthly paradises. On this account, the entire departure of our whole colored population, would ruin the southern states; and the slaveholders know it; and will never therefore part with their colored population, on any terms or conditions. They will finally consent to a general abolition; but never to a general colonization. The latter would be their certain ruin; of which fact they are fully aware. Nor will they care any more about amalgamation after abolition, than they did before. It is the *absence;* not the presence of free emancipated blacks, that the country would have any just cause to deplore.

So eager are the slaveholders to perpetuate and extend slavery, (and of course to perpetuate and extend amalgamation,) that they are endeavoring by open force and fraud, and by the most reckless violations of the Law of Nations, to annex Texas to this country, *for this very purpose.* Here is a new and widely extended field opened, by these atrociously wicked means, for the extension of slavery, and its necessary attendant, amalgamation; these being the two principal objects of the Texian rebellion. Yet not one of the amalgamation alarmists, has raised his voice against the project! Free amalgamation is the object of their constant horror; but in *slave* amalgamation, they have the utmost complacency and satisfaction. It is only when the liberty and equal rights of colored people are proposed, that they become convulsed

with fear, of this imaginary evil! What plainer proof can we have, of their shameless hypocrisy, and degrading moral corruption?

Many of the corruptionists I have here exposed, have raised and spread the amalgamation alarm, for the purpose of promoting the colonization scheme; as well as hindering the progress of abolition. But as many honest people have, through their corrupt agency, suffered themselves to be misled, by this foolish bug-bear of amalgamation, I will for their sake treat the subject seriously. I do not apprehend an amalgamation of color, to any considerable extent, in a state of perfect freedom to both races. A few solitary cases might now and then occur; as they now do in the free states; and but a few. The natural repugnance of the two races, will in such a state, be a very effectual general bar to the practice; such freedom being the only means, to restore the free operation of the bar. Slavery has caused almost all the amalgamation in the country; and abolition will put an almost entire stop to it. I believe this; because there will be nothing like a *necessity*; no special temptation, (as there now is, on account of the unprotected condition of female slaves,) for amalgamation. Each race being furnished, with its own proportional sexual distribution, its own proportion of males and females, will have no necessary motive or strong temptation, to seek to amalgamate with the other.—The rights and chastity of colored women, being protected by law, the violence which is now the most rapid agent of amalgamation, will cease, and with it the practice itself. In the British West Indies, where the same alarm had been circulated, in its most odious and frightful colors, the scarecrow of amalgamation has wholly vanished; the alarmists themselves being anxious, to prevent their colored people, from leaving them! Nothing is less thought of or cared about, than amalgamation, in all those islands. Both races find they have other lawful business, of much more importance to attend to.

Marriage when free, is generally a matter of *taste*. And neither marriage nor other social intercourse, are matters of natural right. They depend wholly on contract or agreement. No person has a *right* to enjoy the company or society of another, without his or her free consent. The *natural* Rights, such as Security, Liberty, Property, &c., are independent of the consent of others, being *exclusive* & not conventional rights; as was stated in the First Lecture. But Marriage and Social Intercourse are not; being merely conventional rights; and therefore entirely dependant on the consent of others. Complete abolition will give no right to amalgamate, unless it be perfectly voluntary on both sides; and this volition, or free choice, owing to *distaste*, will be seldom exercised. Nor are Americans the only people who fear amalgamation. The upper ranks of society in Europe, will no sooner amalgamate with the lower, than our whites will with the negroes; a fact which proves, that *condition* as well as color, has much agency in the production of 'prejudice.' Nor will abolition lessen the distaste or dislike to color. It will only put an end to the prejudice against *rights;* and that system of wrong, violence and brutal insult, which is the principal cause, of all the amalgamation in the country. And though complete emancipation will give the conventional *right* of legal amalgamation; yet where two races of people, have such a natural distaste to each others' persons, as the whites and black have, there will never be any danger of their amalgamating, to any alarming or injurious extent. Such emancipation renders amalgamation fears, what they ought always to be—a mere subject of ridicule.

Many people seem to fear legal amalgamation, as an *evil;* and it really is so in all respects, so long as colored people are compelled to remain *degraded* in society; and it is always an evil to the feelings of those, who have a disrelish to it; as most people really have. And if it be a real evil, the white people have no right to complain of it; for it is they, and not the colored people, who have introduced and supported all the amalgamation in the country. Injuries to taste at least, are no excuse for violations of *rights*. We are perfectly sensible they are not in other cases. Our tastes are frequently offended; but we never think of violating the *rights* of any body, on *that* account, except those of the colored people. If a white person does nothing more than offend our *taste*, we never think of injuring him for that reason; a fact which proves, that there is no connexion between slavery and *color;* for if there were, white color would, for any thing we know to the contrary, be as likely to produce slavery, as black

or any other color! Nor is such a motive for the violation of rights, ever permitted in the Scriptures; a fact that proves it to be blasphemous. And the rejection of it in every other case proves, that had not slavery existed, we should never have thought of *enslaving* colored people, or otherwise abusing them, on account of amalgamation, or any other mere offence to *taste*. And were slavery now to be abolished, we should never think of reviving it, to *prevent* amalgamation. For such revival we perfectly know, would only increase this 'evil,' a hundred fold faster, than it would increase, in a state of perfect freedom to both races.

The inquiry may be made, if any *special* measures would be necessary or advisable, in a state of perfect freedom to both races, to prevent amalgamation? I answer no; none at all will be necessary; because there will be no danger of it. As an offence to my own taste, I would in all cases oppose it, if necessary, so far as I could *without violating the Law of God.*— We always instinctively oppose other offences against our taste, within these sacred limits; and thus far commit no sin, by so doing; and so far it would be perfectly just and right to oppose the legal amalgamation of the two races; but no farther. Abolitionists as such, desire no amalgamation of color. They only desire an amalgamation of *rights*. But say their enemies; the one amalgamation will lead to the other. If the whites and blacks are allowed the *right* to intermarry, they will do so. This is a mistake. The effect will be directly the other way. If they will have the right to intermarry, they will also have the right, *not* to intermarry; and this latter right, owing to distaste and repugnancy, will always be exercised by both races. The mere conventional right of matrimony will have no effect to produce a general amalgamation, in comparison of that, which the slave rights of ravishment and prostitution now have. It is for the want of an amalgamation of rights, that that of color increases at the rate it now does, in the slave states.

I have stated, that marriage and social intercourse, are not matters of natural right, but exist in contract and agreement merely. We are perfectly sensible in other cases, that they depend wholly on the agreements and consent of parties; and that a refusal of such rights, does not justly interrupt the harmony of society; because it never justly disturbs or infringes, any persons rights. In European society it is as disgraceful for the higher ranks to associate openly and publicly with the lower, as it is in this country, for white people to associate thus with negroes. The civil and religious equality of mankind, does not include their social equality. The former are matters of strict exclusive right; the latter of contract. The *Natural* Rights, such as Security, Liberty and Property before mentioned, and the Relative Rights of husband and wife, parent and child, &c. are matters of strict exclusive right, independent of the consent of others, given to us by our Maker. All other rights are matters, either of contract or usurpation.

Different *races* of men may live intermingled in society, in the enjoyment of equal rights, without any amalgamation, with as much harmony and as little disturbance and trouble, as different sects and languages do. Nothing is easier or more natural in *practice*, however difficult it seems in theory and prospect; as all white people who live near colored neighbors, in free countries, well know. Sects and languages never amalgamate, though existing for ages in the same neighborhoods; on account of their repugnancy. All sectarians well know, there is no danger of such amalgamation, on this account. Nor will there be any danger of amalgamation of color, in a state of freedom, for the same reason.

I for one am of the opinion, that the permanent settlement of our colored people in this country, *in a state of permanent freedom and equality of rights*, will be one of the greatest blessings the country can enjoy; because they only can cultivate the extreme southern part of it.— The rich products of those hot regions, so necessary to feed and clothe the nation, can only be raised and brought to market, by the labor of those people. No other event would go half so far, to ruin the wealth and prosperity of the country, as their departure. It is not negroes, but *slavery*, that ruins the country. Slavery alone, has rendered them and the whites curses to each other; or rather, has cursed them both. Perfect freedom alone, will render them both the greatest blessings to each other.

To prevent illegal amalgamation, the same as illegal cohabitation of any kind, nothing more will be necessary, than virtuous education and consequent good morals. Mere literary education alone, will not make society virtuous, prosperous and happy; however much it may polish and refine it. Nay, without morality, such education seems to render men the more wicked; as the conduct of a great portion of the wealthiest class will testify. Many of the worst and vilest corruptionists in existence, possess great literary accomplishments; so necessary is good moral education, to form virtuous society. Genuine christian morality united with literature, will alone enable men, to realize the blessings of universal freedom. And these acquirements are all that will ever be necessary, to insure the greatest prosperity and happiness to both races, living together unamalgamated, in a state of perfect republican equality of rights. Our wicked hatred of the black race is now so strong, owing to our habitual aristocratic prejudices, against their enslaved and degraded *condition*, that this effect seems on the first view, to be incredible and impossible. But the habit of treating their rights with respect, which abolition and law together must produce, would soon remove the apparent impossibility. How many things are now in familiar use, that were once deemed impossible! Hundreds of such cases may be cited from history. How many useful projects and inventions, that were once pronounced visionary and impracticable, and which drew popular odium on their authors, are now celebrated for their utility and excellence! Nothing that now *appears* to many minds, so difficult and formidable, will on fair trial be found easier or more agreeable in practice, than the legal and republican equality of the two races. And the time is not far distant, when every body will wonder, there should ever have been any supposed difficulty about it.

Many have imagined, that the two races *cannot* live intermixed (not amalgamated) in society, on terms of legal equality; or, both in possession of equal legal rights. They seem to reason, as if there were some *natural* cause or impediment, to obstruct and prevent such equality; or, as if human *rights* must necessarily be as different, as human color; whereas rights are by the gift and appointment of God, as *common* to all mankind, as their speech and reason, their shape and organization, their faculties and abilities, their wants and desires, their passions and appetites, or other essential qualities; or as the elements by which they are supported are. Whether the two races, living together in the same society or country, *can* enjoy equal rights, primarily depends, as already remarked, on the equal operation of *equal Law*. Let the *Laws* be equal, and their *Rights* will be equal; and to render the laws equal, let them be made and administered, by all the citizens equally, without regard to color or other physical peculiarities. If the *Law* equalizes men's rights, they will remain equal, so long as the law remains in force. Nor will it be possible for evil disposed men, to destroy this equality, unless they first destroy the law, or prevent its operation. Nor if the law equalizes human rights, is it of any consequence, so long as the law remains in force, how many different races or varieties of men, live in the same society; any more than it is, how many different sects, languages or religions exist in the same society.—It might as well be pretended, that horses and cattle of different colors, cannot live together in the same pasture, or that goods of different colors cannot lie on the same shelf, as that men of different colors, cannot live in the same society, without destroying each others' rights. Such pretended inability or necessity, is a contemptible phantom, as before remarked. It was formerly seriously and perhaps honestly supposed, that orthodox and heretical christians, could not live together in the same society; a notion no more absurd, than the one under consideration. But we know that this foolery was, by liberal sentiments and equal laws, exploded long ago. And it was not the only nonsense the world needed ridding of.

I have been the more prolix in my remarks, on this phantom of amalgamation, in consequence of having observed, that it is the strongest objection, some honest people appear to have to abolition; and is the principal reason why they adhere, to the hopeless and criminal scheme of colonization. One objection will often weigh with some, that will have no effect on others; and I think it probable, that this one contemptible as it is, has had the greatest weight in many honest minds, of any. None of the objections, urged against the abolition of slavery, have any intrinsic merit; and this one on a critical examination, is discovered to be as groundless and worthless as the rest; and only needs to have its demerits thoroughly exposed, to be like the rest contemptuously rejected.

15th Obj.—*Dissolution of the Union.*

The slaveholders threaten to dissolve the union, because a 'contemptible band of fanatics,' as they sneeringly call the abolitionists, will agitate the 'delicate subject' of slavery, and urge its abolition. Where then, I ask, is the boasted and puffed 'chivalry' of the south? Is it really 'chivalrous' and magnanimous; is it 'high-souled' conduct, for men professing such great and noble qualities, to pay so much regard, to such a 'contemptible' agency, as on account of it, to threaten the commission of the highest criminal offence, of which the subjects of government are capable! A lion will not attack a mouse. And it must be a new sort of 'chivalry,' that would deign to attack such 'contemptible' opponents, as the slaveholders represent the abolitionists to be.

And what too when viewed with this treasonable threat, becomes of the slaveholding as well as doughfaced pretence, of the '*contentment*' and '*happiness*' of the slaves! What; a 'contemptible cause agitate and 'influence,' such a 'happy' and 'contented' set of beings, to such a degree, as to render a dissolution of the union necessary, in order to counteract the effect! O consistency; thou art indeed 'a rare jewel,' among people of a particular description. The slaveholders declare their slaves to be, 'better off than the northern laborers'; to be 'the happiest peasantry in the world,' and 'so contented, they would not take their freedom as a gift'; but yet, if the subjects of slavery and abolition be agitated at all, even at the north, where it can have 'no effect,' and by 'contemptible fanatics' too, it will cause such an 'excitement among the slaves,' as to render a dissolution of the union necessary, to enable the masters, to hold this 'peculiar species of property' in security!!

Viewed in the light of the avowed motives, from which the threat is made, its plain import and effect, an effect as clear as if made in so many words, is, that if the abolitionists do right, the slaveholders will do wrong; that if the former continue to preach righteousness and repentance from sin, the latter will sin still the harder; that if the former will persist, in the discharge of a Divine duty and obligation, in the exercise of constitutional and Divine rights both, the latter will certainly commit treason and other atrocious crimes! Because abolitionists are determined to obey the commands of God, they are the more determined to violate them! Because the former will serve God, they will serve the devil! And the *morality* of it is, that because the slaveholders will sin, the abolitionists ought to sin also, by neglecting to 'open their mouths for the dumb'; just as if the sins of the former can excuse those of the latter! If this is not the exact language of the threat, it is its exact *meaning* and effect, when compared with the motives with which it is made; motives in which the 'men-stealers' are justified, by all their doughfaced allies in the free states. But are the crimes or criminal threats of wicked men, any excuse for the neglect of christian duty? Are we at liberty to sin because others do? The spirit of the scriptures says they are not; vide Isa. lviii 1, Eze. iii 7-11, 17, 18, Mic. iii 5-8, 2d Tim. iv 2-5, and a great number of similar passages. The holy prophets, whose example is specially intended for our imitation, boldly delivered their messages, in spite of wicked threats and persecutions. Christ commanded his apostles, to 'preach the gospel to every creature'; though he at the same time informed them, they would be persecuted and put to death for doing so. In imitation of these examples, Luther, and other reformers, persevered in their 'works of righteousness,' in spite of the most wicked and ferocious threats, and the most imminent dangers; and have since been celebrated as worthy christian reformers, for this special christian duty. Besides, a contrary course does like the false prophets, make the wills of wicked men the rule of duty, instead of the will of God! Appropriate examples may also be selected from prophane history. In our revolutionary war, for instance, the tories and cowards exhorted the colonists to submission, without making any attempts to assert their rights, or redress their wrongs; because such attempts would only provoke the British government, to retaliate by still greater oppressions.—But this danger was wisely held to be no good motive, for tame submission to open tyranny.—And what would be thought of the patriotism of such, as should advise silent submission, to every unprovoked attack on our national rights, merely because tyrants threaten resistance with retaliation! We know such advisers would be treated, with open contempt and abhorrence. But for arguments sake, suppose the abolitionists actually do wrong, to the injury of the slaveholders. Will their sins excuse those of the latter? Will they justify the slaveholders in oppressing other people? Can crime ever justify crime? We all know it cannot. And if the slaveholders are really 'injured' by abolitionists, why do they not apply to the *law* for redress; as for other injuries received, and not threaten to break law, because others, as they pretend, do wrong without breaking it! Or if they have no legal redress, (as they admit they have not;) is this because the law, or their own conduct, is wrong and defective? Surely to violate good laws of every kind, both Divine and human, merely because others *obey* such laws, (as the abolitionists now clearly do,) is conduct most blasphemously criminal. And this is the only motive the slaveholders have, for threatening to dissolve the union!!

And the slaveholders and their advocates complain, of the just and reasonable provocation they have, to instigate them to this treasonable design. Let us consider the nature of this 'provocation.' Obedience to the commands of God, a *just* provocation to commit crimes! Imitating the example of our Saviour, the prophets, apostles and martyrs, a *just* provocation! 'Doing as we would be done by,' a *just* and *reasonable* 'provocation.' Crimes are always committed from bad motives; and none but the greatest criminals ever allege the the 'practice of righteousness' as such. And none therefore can be worse, than the slaveholders and their friends avow. They are open blasphemy.

And suppose this treasonable pretence to be as true, as it is contemptibly false. Must salutary reforms never be undertaken, because the vices and evils to be reformed, produce danger to the reformers? Have we a right to make the wicked wills of wicked men, the rule of duty, instead of the Divine will! Must crime never be attempted to be abolished, and criminal customs reformed, because the criminals threaten treason if the attempt is made! Suppose all the counterfeiters, robbers, and other criminals in the country, should threaten as the slaveholders do, to

dissolve the union, if attempts be made to abolish their criminal practices; ought not such attempts nevertheless to be made? Must the whole gospel never be proclaimed, because wicked men now as they formerly did, threaten the commission of crimes if it is? Or shall we let the quiet progress of crime alone, and the country go on to certain destruction, because others threaten still more crimes, if such 'interference' is attempted; and then call this acquiescence *patriotism!* Where is the christian morality or even *prudence*, that justifies such abstinence from such a motive? Besides, will the dangers or difficulties of abolition, become less by delay? Every body knows that both are daily increasing; and that delay has no effect but to accelerate that increase. Those difficulties are less *now* than they ever will be again by *delay*. The best policy therefore dictates, that if a persevering attempt is ever to be made, to abolish slavery, it ought to be made *now*, without a moment's unnecessary delay or relaxation. And again; the alternative is now presented by the slaveholders, either of the dissolution of the union, or of that of the liberties of the northern people; the union and slavery, or disunion and liberty, or rather slavery or disunion. Supposing this dreadful alternative to be really inevitable, as some doughfaced alarmists will have it to be; would a man who has the spirit of liberty in him, hesitate which to choose? Which is the least of the two evils, universal slavery, or disunion with slaveholders?

The 'union' is already, in effect, to a great extent 'dissolved.' It affords not the slightest protection, to the constitional rights of abolitionists, in any of the slave states; and does not prevent the grossest outrages on those rights, and generally without any redress, in the so called 'free' states. Our 'glorious union,' effected by means of our 'noble constitution,' intended to provide for the '*common* defence,' and to '*secure* the blessings of liberty,' &c., is of no value to freemen in the slave states, and in some parts of the free states. None of them are any the more *secure* in the slave states, on account of the 'union.' None of their just rights are at all respected in those states, on account of the *union* or constitution. The slaveholders and their tools, are organized as a vast banditti, in all those states, to outrage and murder all abolitionists, without the slightest regard to legal rights or constitutional guarantees, not even in point of form. More than half a million of people, are thus practically outlawed, without crime, in their own native country! And the facts here detailed show, that though the slaveholders have no just provocation, for a dissolution of the union, the people in the free states have. They and they only have received sufficient provocation. For as the 'union' affords no protection, to some of their dearest rights, why should they value it more than the violators of those rights do! Our forefathers received no greater provocation from the British government, to dissolve their connexion with the British empire, than those that the northern people have received, from the slaveholders. British tyranny was not as cruel and destructive, as slaveholding tyranny is; yet our forefathers 'dissolved' their British 'union,' on account of it. But such is the love of their descendants for our *own* 'union,' that none of them have threatened its dissolution, except those who have given the only just provocation for it!

And the abolitionists have been frequently *warned*, both in the spirit of caution and menace, of the *consequences* of their schemes; that is to say, *warned* of the 'consequences' of the practice of righteousness! So were the prophets and apostles warned, of the same kind of 'consequences;'—vide 1st Kings xviii 17, Acts iv 17–21, v 40, xvi 20–24, xvii 5–7, 32, and other passages. So were Luther, Knox and Wesley 'warned in the same way. So have all reformers been 'warned.' But what do such 'warnings' mean? Why simply, that bad men will commit crimes, if good men do their duty, in obedience to the commands of God! Thus our forefathers were 'warned,' of the consequences of their resistance to British tyranny. Such blasphemous 'warnings have been common in every age, to deter the friends of righteousness, from attempting salutary reforms. And these 'warnings' come only from persons, who were never known to warn their guilty countrymen, of the 'consequences' of persistance in the *sin of slavery;* though such consequences are the only ones to be justly feared. And it should be remarked also, that these slavish 'warnings,' are of the vengeance of wicked *men* only; to the entire disregard of the vengeance of the Almighty! But are *such* 'warnings' to be heeded?—vide Matt. x 25–28. It is God alone and His displeasure that we ought to fear; vide Job x 4, Prov. i 7, Isa. viii 12, 13, Eze. xxii 14, Luke xii 4, 5, 1st Pet. iii 14. And as He has commanded us to overthrow slavery, we are under a Divine obligation to fulfil the command; in comparison of which, all the threats and 'solemn warnings' of reprobate men, are not of the slightest importance; except as an additional motive, to zeal in the work. So abolitionists have been warned, of the *frowns* of society, by men who fear such 'frowns,' more than they do those of their Maker. The frowns of a virtuous public sentiment, are a merited disgrace and just punishment, to bad characters. But the 'frowns' of such a sentiment as that produced by slavery, are the greatest honor that an abolitionist, or other lover of righteousness can have; as great as the 'frowns' of the corrupt Jews were to the prophets and apostles; as those of the Roman government and people were to the martyrs; or as those of the papal hierarchy were to Luther and the other reformers. Why need abolitionists trouble themselves about *such* 'frowns,' or other criminal threats; so long as they give no just cause for them? For it is certain that they have never given any such cause, unless 'works of righteousness' are such. And when and where was it ev-

er held, by any except tyrants, that proclamations of the truth and exhortations to righteousness, were a just cause for such threats? And who, but such as Pharaoh, Herod, Nero, Caligula and Robespierre, ever uttered such threats or 'warnings,' on such pretences? Who but real reprobates ever use them, to prevent works of righteousness? And are *their* frowns deserving the notice of righteous men? And are criminal threats and pretences ever a justifiable motive, for neglect of the commands of God? 'Let us not be deceived,' for 'God will not be mocked' in this way; vide Job xiii 8, 9, Prov. xxix 25, Gal. vi 7. The wicked threats of slaveholding tyrants, are no more to be regarded by the friends of righteousness, than the 'idle wind' that passes us. It is highly sinful to be deterred by such threats, from the discharge of known duty.

And in the same spirit with these threats, is the charge of '*rashness*,' so currently reported against the abolitionists, their cause, measures and spirit. As before remarked of the charge of 'imprudence;' the charge is true only in the corrupt sense, that all 'works and workers of righteousness' are 'rash.' If to obey the commands of God, in preference to those of mobs and tyrants, to practice the Golden Rule, in spite of threats and menaces for doing it; to exercise constitutional rights in a constitutional manner, for the best good of the country; if *these* acts are 'rashness;' *then* abolition is nothing but 'rashness!' If our Saviour, the prophets, apostles, martyrs and reformers were 'rash' 'misguided' men, then the modern abolitionists are very 'rash' people; otherwise the charge is like all the other charges against abolitionism, a simple falsehood.

Were we to place any confidence, in the *sincerity* of the threats, of a 'dissolution of the union, 'civil war,' &c., uttered by the slaveholders, we might have some reason to fear those evils; or at least, that *attempts* would be made to produce them. A great uproar is made and alarms raised of such dissolution; and all as is declared, on account of the peaceable, legal and righteous efforts, of a 'contemptible handful of fanatics,' to abolish the customary practice, of one of the greatest of crimes! The notes of alarm resound from all parts of the slave states; and are re-echoed in all parts of the free states. Southern governors and legislators, in their official capacity; large public meetings of southern citizens; bodies of southern clergy; southern newspapers and periodicals, roar lustily with threats, imprecations and maledictions, of every description, and with imperious remonstrances to their 'northern brethren,' on account of the conduct and measures of the 'fanatics.' Large rewards have been offered, for the kidnapping of leading abolitionists; and special legislation demanded to silence them. The whole south professes to be in a state of alarm, bordering on frenzy. And yet the northern 'friends' of these alarmists tell us, the abolitionists can produce 'no effect' on the south!

We should notice also, *from whom* and *for what*, these criminal threats of disunion come;—and *by whom* they are uttered. They have not been thrown out by the abolitionists. There is no danger of treason, not even threats of it from *them*. They are firm friends to the union; and will support it to the last. They are the threats of slaveholders only; who of all men in the country have the least good reason to make them, except as scarecrows to frighten doughfaces with; and their only excuses are, the exercise of Divine rights and duties by abolitionists, and the pretended fear of servile troubles in consequence. Nothing can be wickeder than their motives; or weaker or less able to carry their treasonable threats into execution, than the slaveholders are, *if confined to their own resources*. Could they obtain sufficient northern assistance' they might perhaps be able to sever the union, and support their slave system afterwards; but not without. This fact renders it probable, that their treasonable threats are only made, for the purpose of procuring this support. It proves also, that slavery is the only guilty cause, that threatens a dissolution of the union. It is the *defence*, and not the attack, on the abomination, that threatens this dissolution.

Slavery has so paralyzed and weakened, the military resources of the slave states, that if left to contend alone single handed, those states must fall a prey to any powerful invader, unless they first abolish slavery. This internal weakness of the slave states, is seen and acknowledged by all, who are well acquainted with their social organization. The slaveholders are brave and well armed, but they have in their midst a most formidable enemy, necessarily and justly rendered such, in the persons of their own slaves. In case of a foreign war with any great and warlike power, they cannot alone defend themselves, and at the same time guard their slaves. The *union* is, therefore, the only sure protection to the slave states, in time of great danger from war, —and the dissolution of it without abolition, is the only event that will certainly expose them, to a repetition of the 'horrors of St. Domingo;' which they now pretend so much to fear, *with* the union. For them to dissolve the union would be to 'jump out of the frying pan into the fire.' After dissolution they could not in such an emergency, expect any foreign assistance;—the foreign powers able to render such assistance, being now hostile to slavery. Not one of them will assist other nations in restoring or protecting the abomination. To believe that under such circumstances, the slaveholders are serious in their treasonable threats, is to believe them to be what they call the abolitionists—madmen. Especially must we thus believe, if their object is to *support* slavery; for no means can destroy the curse so soon, as such dissolution.—Such an event would not suspend the operation, of any part of the abolition machinery, not even 'incendiary circulars,' for a moment: but would increase and animate every part of that machinery greatly; while the facilities for the escape and protection of runaway slaves, owing to the

irritation of the northern people, would be increased more than ten fold. The spirit of the age is so hostile to slavery, that it could no longer any where find a refuge on this continent; and would quickly come to an end. The 'union' is now the last and only sure support of slavery; and if it falls, slavery very certainly falls with it. An attempt by the slaveholders therefore, to dissolve the union for the support of slavery, would be conduct similar to that of the man, who threatened to cut his own throat to save his life!

The union is of great value to the free states; but not of half the value it is to the slave states. The latter are much more dependant on the former, than these last on them. The slave states cannot engage extensively in commerce and manufactures, so long as their slave system continues. Nor would their necessary intercourse with the free states, be materially interrupted by disunion. It would still go on as before; and abolition principles spread faster with, than they now do without disunion. The slave states cannot now exist, as independent sovereignties at all, without either the union or abolition. If left to contend alone with any great foreign power, either they or their slave system must fall; and probably both together. The northern states may preserve their independence without the union; the southern never can. Disunion would present a most tempting occasion, to 'foreign interference' with their independence. And their own treatment of Mexico at the present time, would be used against them, as the ready pretext for such 'interference.' The free states may preserve their independence after disunion; but the slave states never can without abolition. Of this alarming fact, the best informed inhabitants of the slave states are aware. So dangerous is the condition of those states, *with* the union, that they are obliged to keep up a constant military police and preparation, even in time of peace. Their guards and patrols continually scour the country, by day and night, to prevent insurrections. The danger to these states from this cause, is greatly increased by war; and in this event, without the union, it would be increased many fold. There cannot therefore be any serious danger of disunion, from the slaveholders. Though they threaten hard, in their impotent malice against the abolitionists, they will be the last persons to carry their threats into execution. They will never dare to do it, while slavery continues. They well know it would be an act of political suicide. The most serious danger of disunion is from *without;* not within the republic; which danger abolition alone can remove.

I readily admit, that it would be the highest injustice and lowest meanness, to derive a motive from the internal weakness of the slave states, to induce the slaveholders, to part with any of their *just* rights and privileges. And did the abolitionists seek to persuade the slaveholders, to renounce any such rights, they would be justly obnoxious to the severest censures.—But they only ask them to renounce crime; to quit man-stealing. They only request them to practice righteousness; and thus insure their own peace, prosperity and happiness; to give up those *unjust* rights, which we have seen are eternal wrongs—and thus refrain from 'treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath.' They only desire them to cease from doing wrong, in order to do right. Nor do they make these righteous requests, because the slaveholders are weak and defenceless; but because truth and righteousness are mighty, and must and ought to prevail. A just and reasonable request is always right and proper, under any circumstances; and can never be a just cause, for crime or criminal threats. And most just, reasonable and proper, at all times, are requests to cease from the commission of sin, and to work righteousness in its stead.

16th Obj.—*Cowardice.*

The charge of *cowardice* made against abolitionists, for refusing to 'go to the south' and be murdered, during the present furious excitement there, would not be worth notice, were it not for the just occasion it offers, of retort and rebuke to adversaries.

The charge places those who make it, in this dilemma. If they say it is *not* the duty of abolitionists to 'go to the south,' they have no right to make the charge; for there is no occasion for it. If they say it *is* their duty, they convict themselves of hypocrisy; for as the Divine

commands are *universal*, being obligatory on all men alike, the objectors thereby declare it to be their *own* duty, to preach abolition at the south. Nor if they are really under this obligation, is it any excuse or discharge to them from the same, that they do not realize it. The ready retort then occurs; why then do they not teach abolitionists their duty, by *example* as well as precept? Why do not *they* 'go to the south and preach abolition?' The spirit of the Scriptures leave us no room to doubt, respecting the duty of abolitionists in the present trying crisis. Reformers are taught by this spirit, never to expose themselves to *useless* danger, in circumstances of great trouble and difficulty; but always to avoid *such* danger; vide 1 Kings xviii 4, 13, xix 3, 4, 9, 10. Matt. ii 13, iv 12, x 23, xii 14, 15, xxiv 16, Mark xiii 14, Luke xxi 21, Acts viii 1, ix 24, 25, xiv 5, 6, Heb. xi 36–38, and various other passages. These examples teach us, carefully to preserve our lives, from unnecessary useless exposure. It will not be pretended by any honest person, that abolition reformers can do as much good at the present time, by going into the slave states, as by remaining out of them. It is only when reformers cannot *avoid* danger, that the Scriptures require them to encounter it boldly; and not to renounce the truth, though at the risk of martyrdom. None ever raised this pretence, except those who were animated by the spirit of murder against abolitionists. None ever reproached others, for refusing to go where they were sure to be murdered, unless they wished them to be murdered.

Though this pretence has no proper reference to the merits of abolition, it is fair to retort the charge of cowardice, on those to whom of all men it most properly belongs,—the slaveholders and their supporters; for there is not another so cowardly a practice in existence as slaveholding. It is simply wronging the weaker out of all their rights and happiness, by the force and fraud of the stronger. Such conduct in every other case, is justly treated as the basest cowardice. All the means used, to support the practice, such as the hunting, punishing, torturing and murder of the helpless slaves, are the most cowardly conceivable; and would, were it not for the dreadful corruptions of the country, be acknowledged and treated as such. The fruits of the practice are of the most cowardly kind. There is probably more ferocity, ruffianism, vanity and conceit, and less of true honesty, honor and courage, in our slave states, than in any other civilized country.

The general opposition to abolition, is also distinguished, by the peculiar meanness of its cowardice. The cowardice of mobs is proverbial; and our anti-abolition mobs have done ample justice to their ancient character. Equally remarkable is the cowardice of most of the American newspapers; those 'sentinels of freedom,' as they have been miscalled; but which ought more properly to be designated 'sentinels of slavery.' Though anti-slavery intelligence has been of more importance to the country than any other, these brave 'sentinels' have not only refused to give it, but have prostituted themselves to belie, vilify and slander abolition, through fear of losing corrupt *patronage!* The same severe retort applies also, to the cowardly and corrupt American pulpit, bar, and other leading moral or rather immoral influences of this corrupt country. Scarce a preacher or pleader dares allude to the 'delicate subject' of slavery, for fear of giving offence to their corrupt hearers, though the Divine command is plain, to 'lift up their voices like a trumpet' against the abomination. So the American bench and legislative halls are influenced with the same spirit of corrupt sycophantic cowardice; legislating, expounding, enforcing and executing laws in many cases, with special reference to the support and perpetuity of slavery, out of fear of the wrath of the oppressors.

I have thus endeavored to refute all the principal Objections and Pretences, forged by the enemies of universal freedom, to prevent the abolition of American slavery. And such another tissue of inconsistency, contradiction, sophistry and blasphemy as they present, were never before exhibited for the support of crime. And the frequency and confidence with which they are advanced, in all parts of the United States, without any apparent remorse or shame, exhibits fearful evidence of a strong spirit of reprobation, widely spread through the country. When persons are to be found reckless enough, *seriously* to maintain, even in public debate, that slavery is the '*handmaid*' of liberty, and *necessary* to its support and protection, and without reflecting or perhaps suspecting, that in morals as in physics, the more of one moral opposite

there is, the least there must be of the other ; as the more of sin the less of holiness, the more licentiousness the less purity, the more knavery the less honesty, &c.; the same as in physics, the more weakness the less strength, the more sickness the less health, the more darkness the less light, &c.; and to deny the right of moral interference with sin, because it is licensed by *human* laws ; when men I say are found wicked and perverted enough, seriously to advocate such stupid blasphemy, and others are found stupid enough apparently to believe it, both must be very near reprobation. And the constant use of these Objections in the free states also proves, that the north *does* support slavery, both directly and indirectly ; for they cannot be used any where for any other purpose. And were it not for this northern support, the abomination would not exist five years, in any part of the union.

The three great obstacles to abolition in the United States, are their *Aristocracy, Ignorance* and *Moral Corruption*, being chiefly the fruits of the *Pride* engendered by slavery. On every side the abolition cause encounters these foes. But there is not a vice denounced in the Scriptures with more terrible retribution than that of *Pride ;* vide Lev. xxvi 19, Ps. xviii 27, ci 5, Prov. vi 17, viii 13, xvi 5, 18, Isa. ii 12, 17, v 13, 15, xiii 11. Matt. iv 1, Luke i 51, James iv 6, and a thousand other passages. While no virtue is more strongly inculcated and blessed, than the opposite one of *Humility*, or the disposition to respect the rights and happiness of others, the same as our own ; vide Job xxii 29, Ps. ix 12, Prov. xv 33, xvi 19, xviii 12, xxii 4, Isa. lvii 15, lxvi 2, Matt. v 3, Acts xx 19, 1st Pet. v 5, &c. Pride and Humility are frequently contrasted with each other both by precept and example, and their different effects illustrated in the Scriptures; as in the story of Mordecai and Haman, the parable of Dives and Lazarus, &c. Slavery is founded on the first and Abolition on the last ; and the curses of the one appertain to the former, and the blessings of the other to the latter.

From this spirit of Pride has sprung that excessive *Hypocrisy* before alluded to, so excessively disgraceful to the country ; and which is so shamefully exhibited in the nature of the boasted American *Liberty*, as exemplified in the treatment of one-sixth of the native population. In this exemplification, it is the *liberty*, of destroying freedom by depriving innocent persons of all their liberty; the *liberty*, of owning, buying, selling, ravishing, starving, torturing and *enslaving* others ; the *liberty*, of 'interfering with' the just rights of others to their destruction, and, at the same time denying all right of 'interference,' with so great a crime; the *liberty*, of misrepresenting, belying, persecuting, abusing, mobbing and lynching, all who take part with the victims, in ever so just and legal a manner ; the *liberty*, of suppressing freedom of speech and of the press, by mob violence and outrage, of enacting unconstitutional gag laws in the Slave States, and of attempting the same in the free States; the *liberty*, to advocate freedom abroad and support slavery at home, to celebrate and extol the former, and zealously and criminally defend the latter ; the *liberty*, of the customary commission of every crime against the Law of God, and many crimes against the common law, without any real responsibility, for the support of slavery ; the *liberty* to wicked men to do wrong, or the liberty of unrestrained licentiousness. cruelty and slavery ; the *liberty*, in short, every where enjoyed by *tyrants*, to tyranize over all under their power and authority, without check or control ! It is the same kind of 'liberty' that exists in Algiers, Turkey, Russia, and other despotic countries ; the liberty to the few, to do what they please to and with the many, without any responsibility, or the 'liberty' of tyrants only. This is the 'glorious American *Liberty*,' as exemplified in the treatment of one-sixth part of the population !

So this pride has induced the habitual boast, of this as a *free* country, the 'home of the oppressed,' &c. But the greatest share of it has never been 'free' for any thing else but wrongs. And no part of it has ever been perfectly free, to *oppose* those wrongs, even in a legal and constitutional manner. A corrupt public sentiment, or spirit of slavery, backed by a ferocious mob, has always stood ready to silence such opposition, by trampling on constitutional and Divine rights ; as has been lately demonstrated in many infamous cases. The simple discussion of the merits of slavery, has never like that of other subjects, been entirely 'free' in the 'free states.' And the abolitionists now discuss those merits in many parts of those states, at the peril of their rights and lives. As to the slave states, there never has been any more or

other civil freedom in them, than in Algiers and other slave countries. If our slave states are 'free,' then are those countries also 'free;' and may be called in the same sense and with the same propriety, the 'home of the free,' and the 'asylum of the oppressed!'

And this Pride has produced a false christianity, which has induced the American church to send the gospel to the heathen abroad, and neglect those at home; directly contrary to the scriptural injunction; vide Luke xxiv 47. 'Charity should always *begin* at home;' though it should never end there. Besides, our foreign missions can never receive the Divine blessing, so long as they are supported in any degree, by the 'gains of oppression;' vide Isa. lxi 8. The SIN OF ACHAN (covetousness, or the spirit and practice of slavery,) is in the American church; vide Josh. vii &c.; and those who think that benevolent enterprises, supported by the 'blood and tears of innocents' can prosper, will find themselves mistaken; vide Jer. ii 34, 35, xix 4–15, Amos v 21–24, Matt. xxvii 3–5. Property obtained by fraud and crime, as all slave property and its profits are, will never be blessed to the final profit of its owners, however much they may prosper for a season, and even though a portion of it be placed in the 'Lord's Treasury.' It is a great sin to attempt to perform good works, by wicked means or agents; vide Jer. xxii 13, Mic. iii 10–12, Hab. ii 12, &c. A proposed good end can never sanctify and bless wicked means. And those who imagine that it can, indulge in a most pernicious and fatal error. Nor will all our long prayers and long faces and missionary donations, sacrifices and exertions, and pious cant about the 'poor perishing heathen in foreign lands,' atone for the guilt of making hundreds of heathen at home, for one that is converted from heathenism abroad. Until this practice is abolished, our foreign missions never will, as they never yet have, receive the Divine blessing.

ADDENDA.

The following remarks may be added to the 6th page. *Law* is in legal acceptation defined to be, *a rule of human action or conduct:* vide 1 Blac. Com. 38. All such law is either Divine or human; or, the Law of God and the laws of men. We are under inevitable compulsion, either to obey the Law of God, or to suffer the penalties of its violation; and cannot avoid the alternative; because God is infinitely *powerful* and *just*. And any *human* law, constitution, institution or custom, that ordains or authorises violations of the Law of God, is not only a sin but a *national* sin; because such regulations are made in a national *capacity*, are acts of the national *will*, are rules of the national *practice*, and are the best index of the national *morals*; and will be surely and sorely punished in this world. They are high treason against the government of the Almighty. They are *public* crimes; and their guilt and enormity are great, in proportion to the extent of their guilty influence and operation. Nothing is truer than Dr. Priestley's remark, that 'no nation was ever better than its laws, and many have been worse.' Comparing in the light of this correct observation, the American slave code of laws and customs, with those of other slave nations both ancient and modern, it will clearly appear, that the American code is the most oppressive, cruel, savage, barbarous and bloody that ever existed! No savages ever had such savage laws and customs, as those of American *christians!* These not only imprison multitudes of innocent persons for life, but licence every species of torture and murder, to support the imprisonment! The 'Divine' institution of American Slavery cannot be supported without the aid of these legalised crimes, forming a code worse than any heathen code, either in past or present times!

To page 13 add the following. Just and reasonable *Wages* for labour, are commanded by the universal spirit of the Scriptures; and the most terrible threats are directed against those who dare to withhold them; vide Lev. xix 13, Deut. xxiv 14, 15, Jer. xxii 13, Mal. iii 5, Luke x 7, 1st Cor. ix 6–14, James v 4, and numerous other passages. And the same precept is dictated by the Law of Nature; because all ought to share in the proceeds of their own industry. Yet the advocates of slavery tell us, that the Almighty did notwithstanding in the Levitical law, expressly *ordain* and *licence* the contrary practice, of hereditary compulsory labour without wages, and

authorised the masters to employ force, fraud and torture to coerce it !! With such blasphemous contradiction is this horrid pretence fraught. Besides, if it be *right* for man to hold property in man, it must also be *right* for him to practice constant cruelty ; to forbid marriage and licence universal whoredom ; to forbid 'searching the Scriptures,' honoring and obeying parents, and to violate every other Divine command both positive and negative ; and to compel others to violate them, for this kind of 'property' cannot be subjected and controlled, without the constant practice of such violations !!! It must also be *right* for such property holders, to practice continual robbery of the highest kind. For he who deprives innocent persons of their liberty, does them immensely greater injury, than if he plundered them of property only. Life and Liberty are the two greatest gifts of God to man ; the former is worth scarcely any thing without the latter ; and whoever destroys either, except for crimes to warrant such destruction, commits the highest crimes against the Divine Law, and of equal enormity.

To page 17 add the following remarks. The most terrible woes and denunciations are threatened in the Scriptures, against those who oppress *Widows* and *Orphans* ; vide Ex. xxii 22–24, Deut. xxiv 17, Ps. xciv 1, 6, Isa. i 17, Eze. xxii 7, Matt. xxiii 14, James i 27, and other passages. And the Law of Nature teaches, that no conduct can be more atrociously wicked, than such oppression ; as is felt by the instant revulsion it occasions, in every other case, except that of poor, helpless down trodden slaves. Now the practice of slavery does in *effect*, render every slave mother a 'widow,' and every slave child an 'orphan' ; as before explained. It has nearly as much effect, to destroy the domestic relations and sever the dearest ties of nature, and prevent the performance of moral and religious duties, as death and the grave have. And the horrid treatment of these slave 'widows and orphans,' by the unprincipled whites of this country, cannot fail, according to the Divine threats and promises, to cause the Divine vengeance to be poured out on this most guilty nation.

Slavery is also an indirect breach, of all the other commands in the Decalogue ; that is, its *consequences* necessarily produce their constant violation. It compels the slaves to violate the *First* and *Second* commands ; by making the masters the objects of their slavish worship and forcing them to obey their master's wills, though ever so hostile to that of God. To violate the *Third* command ; by the constant temptation offered to all concerned in the practice of slavery, to use the most blasphemously prophane language. To violate the *Fourth ;* by rendering it impossible for the slaves to keep the Sabbath, in the spirit of the command, or to profit by its advantages. The *Fifth ;* by prohibiting slave children, from honoring and obeying their parents. The *Sixth ;* by producing murder in every shape, for the necessary support of slavery. The *Seventh ;* by prohibiting marriage, and thus producing universal licentiousness ; and the *Ninth ;* by producing the universal habit of lying, among all concerned in the practice of Slavery ; as is well exemplified, by the use of the various *Objections* made to abolition, and by the malignant falsehoods circulated respecting abolitionists and slaves. And so of every other Divine command in the Scriptures : slavery either directly or indirectly or both, produces its constant necessary violation. Yet we are told from high clerical authority, that human slavery is a *Divine* institution ; that is, that the Almighty who is infinite in *justice*, *wisdom* and *goodness*, and 'no respecter of persons,' did at the same time that He enacted the rules of the Moral Law, for the government of ALL mankind, also establish an institution, whose necessary tendency and effect was, yet is and ever will be, to prohibit the operation of every one of these rules, by producing their constant violation ; or, that He enacted a code of moral laws, with intent to defeat their operation !! And it is further contended by learned American divines, that this infinitely just, wise and good Being, did at the same time, that He utterly condemned and forbade every kind and degree of Human Oppression, establish the highest degree of such Oppression known, by His Divine Law !!! Thus do these blasphemous corruptionists charge God, with folly and wickedness both ; for the necessary charge is, that He enacted moral rules, for the government of His innocent intelligent creatures, which He determined they should never have power to obey !— Vide Deut. xxxii 4, Job iv 17–21, Rom. ix 14.

On page 19 it should have been remarked : that the *names* by which Slavish Oppression was designated in the Hebrew nation and language, were 'Hard Bondage' and 'Manstealing' ; both of which are described in the sacred context, as the highest species of Human Oppression, a crime condemned and denounced in all parts of the Bible, with the most terrible Divine retribution, both now and hereafter. A critical examination of the two cases, of the sale of Joseph by his brethren and the oppressions of the Hebrews by the Egyptians, will convince every candid mind, that they were the very identical crime of Slavery, 'Man-stealing,' or making property of men, as now practised in the United States and other slave countries ; the punishment of which is death to individuals and destruction to nations. It is the same crime (Slavery) described under other names. And if the crime itself be sufficiently *described*, it is immaterial by *what names* it is described. To illustrate the proposition by other cases, it may be stated ; that the practices of brandy, rum, gin and whiskey drinking are not forbidden in the Scriptures, by *those names*. But the use of *strong drink* and all *drunkenness* and intemperance, are strictly forbidden and denounced in the Scriptures ; as well as all *Man-stealing* (Slavery) and Oppression. So piracy is not forbidden *by that name ;* though every kind of *robbery* is strictly forbidden. And so are many

other crimes to which different names are given in modern times. The *plain* spirit of the Scriptures denounces every crime or sin, whether customary or not, now practiced among modern nations; though frequently under different names; *especially the crime of Human Oppression*, in every form and degree. Those therefore who argue the Divine authority of American Slavery, because it is not condemned by *that name* in the Scriptures, do also argue the Divine authority of brandy, rum, gin and whiskey drinking, of piracy, sodomy, beastiality, counterfeiting, arson, perjury, forgery, and a hundred other atrocious crimes passing by modern names, besides that of 'man-stealing,' for the same profound and honest reason !!!

'Man-Stealing' could not have been any of the *voluntary* 'sales' of men mentioned in the Scriptures; not only because these were approved by the Almighty, but because they were made by the persons 'bought' and 'sold' themselves, and of course, with their own *consent;* and property is never said to be 'stolen,' that is taken with the consent of the true owner. I argue then that modern Slavery is the identical crime of 'Man-Stealing or *involuntary* sales of men; *firstly*, from the *Nature* of the crime of *Stealing*, which is taking *without* the consent of the owner, that which justly belongs to him, and appropriating it to the use of the thief, he knowing that he has no just right to such use; *secondly*, from the *Object* of that crime, which is to use as the *property* of the thief, the thing stolen, whereas every person is, under God, his own 'property;' and *thirdly*, from the case of the sale of Joseph by his brethren, which is expressly called *Stealing*, (vide Gen. xl 15; what none of the voluntary 'sales' are,) in the Scriptures. Other arguments may be used to the same effect; but these reasons are sufficient. 'Man-Stealing' is of course *some* crime or other; and if it be not the modern crime of Slavery, it is not sufficiently described in the Scriptures, to enable us to know what it is.

To page 25 add: that the Scriptures strongly enjoin, the attentive and critical study of the Law of Nature; vide Deut. xvi 29, Prov. ii 2-9, Mic. vi 8, Phil. iv 8, 1st Thess. v 21, and a multitude of other passages.

To page 29 may be added the remark; that the spirit of the Scriptures not only enjoins good civil government, as a Divine institution, but it plainly teaches, that such government should be *republican*, in its *form* and structure. A critical examination of the Jewish theocracy, the only form of civil government that God ever directly established; unveils a beautiful system of republican government, best adapted to protect the equal rights of all its subjects: especially those of the poor and destitute; and the spirit of whose provisions, (except those of the ceremonial kind repealed by the dispensation of Christ,) may be advantageously adopted into every human code and constitution. The spirit of every other part of the Scriptures, also breathes equality of human rights and condition. The Law of Nature plainly intimates the same form of government. In a mere State of Nature as it is called, without any public government and laws at all, the laws of Occupancy and Self Defence only prevail; the consequence of which is, that men become mere Ishmaelites towards each other, and universal anarchy, revenge, robbery, plunder and murder reign uncontrolled. The absolute *necessity* men find themselves under, of establishing civil government, in order to preserve *any* of their rights; and the necessity of a republican form of government, to preserve the *whole* of those rights, prove clearly, that such government under that form, is a rule of the Law of Nature. Infidels as well as christians therefore, ought to have more respect for that great Law, than to pretend to a mere *human* derivation of human rights.

To page 32 add the following: The Bible recognizes and asserts the *existence* of the natural rights of men in the strongest manner, by denouncing and threatening in the severest terms, those who violate them. A critical inspection and analysis of these denunciations will discover, that they are all directed against infringements of the *Security*, the *Liberty* and the *Property*, and of the *Relative* and other just common law rights of men. The technical language and distinctions of the common law are not found in the Bible; but these denunciations of those violations are far more frequent, minute and severe in the Bible, than the penalties of the common law are; which would never have been the case, had not those rights been inherited by men as the gifts of their Maker, and guaranteed to them by the Divine Law. This critical study is one of the most interesting and useful in the great science of the true theology.

To page 37 add; the clearest proof that slavery is no sin of *ignorance*, either in the American church or nation is, that both instantly and clearly perceive and realise this sin, the moment any slavish violence or outrage is offered to *white* persons. In this case, all parties instantly see this crime, and resent it accordingly; so much so, that they sympathise strongly with oppressed whites, even in foreign countries; which they would never do, were they at all ignorant of the sin or sinful nature of Slavery. When William Morgan was kidnapped and probably murdered, every body saw the crime clearly; & raised an uproar accordingly. Nobody attempted to justify the deed from Scripture or the constitution; though such 'justification' was quite as easy, as that of human slavery is. And the same in the case of the supposed murder of S. M. Cornell. Yet many of the reprobates who made the loudest clamour in these two cases, will attempt to justify the vastly worse treatment, of 2,500,000 of their own countrymen, as good by nature as Morgan and Miss Cornell were, and to whom God gave the same rights, by defending their enslavement from the Bible, the constitution, necessity, expediency &c !!! Their behaviour to

wards the slaves, is exactly similar to that of the priest and Levite, towards the wounded man in the parable. And what makes this hypocrisy the more detestable is, they sympathise with the *oppressors* instead of the oppressed; directly contrary to their own conduct in other cases, to the plain commands of God and the dictates of nature. And out of hatred and scorn of their condition, (the very circumstance that ought to enlist their sympathies on the side of the oppressed,) they hate the *rights* of the slaves; whereas we ought always to love and respect the *rights* of men, whether we do their persons and behaviour or not. Besides, the poorest free person in the free states, would not exchange conditions, with the best treated slave in existence; which fact, in common with many others, proves clearly, that slavery has never been any 'sin of ignorance' in this country.

To page 50 add; it is astonishing that so many persons can be found, who will fly into convulsions of rage, if their *own* rights are infringed, but will talk calmly and approvingly, of the utter destruction of the rights of *others*, and justify such destruction from the Bible, the constitution, necessity &c; or in other words, that will 'strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.' Perhaps Pharisaism both in politics and morals, never abounded more than it does at the present time.

To page 52 add; should African colonization ever be thought desirable or expedient, under any circumstances, it ought never to be attempted, until after complete emancipation at home.—The negroes can then emigrate at their own expense, (as the Europeans now do to this country,) without the aid of 'Societies' of any kind. All they demand of the whites is, the liberty and rights that God gave them. When these are restored, they will be their own judges, of the propriety or expediency of their 'colonization,' without the assistance of 'Societies.'

On page 59 it may be remarked; that to affect to condemn or blame any of the ordinary abolition measures, is conduct highly blasphemous; for all those measures are good in themselves, and are fully warranted by the word of God. The course pursued by the modern abolitionists, for the overthrow of Slavery, is God's own appointed 'course.' No person can therefore say that it is a wrong 'course,' without uttering blasphemy. It is charging God with folly! This false charge is also absurd; for if slavery is a bad institution, it ought to be destroyed; and if it is a good one, it has nothing to fear, but every thing to hope, from the 'course' of free discussion and moral opposition pursued by the abolitionists.

To page 63 add the following remarks. It is now fully admitted by all the British politicians, that had as much been known in 1833, respecting the consequences of emancipation, as is now known, the 'apprenticeship' system would never have been adopted. Not a member can now be found in the British parliament, to defend that project, on the grounds either of justice, necessity or expediency. All are now satisfied, that it was not only a useless, but wholly a wrong and unjust measure.

To page 64 add the remark; that though it has often been pretended, even in public debate, that emancipated slaves would *run away*, stroll about the country &c, like so many brutes; yet it never was stated what they would 'run away' &c. *from*; no *motive* is ever assigned, why human beings should thus act like brute animals. Would they 'run away' from the liberty, justice and humanity which they had for the first time received? This is utterly incredible. For who ever before heard of persons *running away from*, good, kind, just treatment! No pretender can allege *one* true motive for such conduct. *Before* emancipation, in a state of the severest *bondage*, the strongest motives that can inspire men, impel the slaves to 'run away;' *after* that event, all motives concur to induce the newly made freemen, to remain contentedly at home.

On page 70 add; the *wants* of emancipated slaves will be much fewer than those of their neighbors. The comparatively few they will have, will therefore be the more easily supplied. This circumstance connected with the others stated on that page, will give greater probability, to the truth of the bold assertions there made. The first fair experiment, will quickly demonstrate the truth of those statements.

On page 71 add. Slavery is the greatest obstacle to public improvements and economy known; a maxim fully verified, by the actual condition of our slave States. Immense tracts of worn out lands; dilapidated plantations and buildings; impoverished and licentious villages; want of canals, bridges, good roads and other public improvements, every where strike the eye of the traveller, standing as monuments of the blasting effects of the curse of slavery, in all parts of these wretched states. Hence the universal comparative poverty, of their wretched inhabitants both bond and free. The abolition of slavery is the remedy and the only complete remedy, for all these evils.

On page 72 add. To call negroes or other colored people who support themselves by honest means, a 'nuisance,' a 'curse' &c., as is habitually done by the enemies of abolition, is not only a direct breach of the ninth commandment, but is blasphemous language; because it reflects dishonour on the Almighty who made them.

To page 76 add the following remarks. In truth and reality, the abolitionists do not 'interfere' with *Rights* at all. Custom has to be sure, made the use of the phrase 'Slave *Rights*' familiar; but in reality, every one of these 'Rights' is an actual '*Wrong*,' crime or sin; as was demonstrated in the First Lecture. It is a gross though customary misnomer, to call these wicked

usurped 'Rights' by that name. They ought always to have been called 'Slave Wrongs' It is 'wrongs' therefore, and wrongs only, that the abolitionists 'interfere' with. It is the slaveholders only, who 'interfere' with the *real* 'rights' of men, to their entire destruction; having been for ages, in the customary habit of such 'interference;' and this their custom they and their friends declare, to be too 'sacred,' even for examination and criticism! They take away all the *Divine* rights of their slaves, and then declare *this* 'interference' to be *just*; but if others 'interfere' to vindicate and restore these plundered rights to their rightful owners, they denounce *such* 'interference' as *unjust*, even though God has commanded it!! Nothing can be clearer than this demonstration. The *morality* of the 'sacred' institution of American Slavery, in the name of this blasphemous pretence therefore is, that the slaveholders have a *just & sacred* right, to 'interfere' with the Divine rights of their innocent slaves, to their total destruction; but the abolitionists have no such right of 'interference,' with slaveholding *wrongs* or sins, in order to vindicate and restore Divine rights, notwithstanding the Almighty has commanded such 'interference,' as a Divine duty !!! Yet this is the 'morality' taught American democrats from their infancy; and great numbers of them practice no other; no rights being with them so 'sacred' as slave 'rights.' Their everlasting prate, cant and swagger, about 'liberty and equal rights,' means the liberty and rights of *white* people only. In American politics, this has been the only customary meaning of those hacknied phrases; and such has hitherto been the genuine morality of American 'democracy!'

To page 83 add the following: A common apology for slaveholding, is the *good treatment* alleged to be exhibited by masters to their slaves; just as if it were possible to treat innocent persons *well*, and at the same time deprive them of their liberty and rights. Deprivation of liberty is nearly as *cruel*, as deprivation of life. We all feel it to be so, in our own cases; and slaves feel it as much as others. Let masters therefore treat their slaves as well as they may, *in other respects*, yet the deprivation of liberty and rights alone, is the highest cruelty. It is impossible to enslave a human being in the least degree, and yet render to him 'good treatment.' No *slave* ever was or ever can be, 'well treated.' Besides, if slaves are 'well treated,' they must be sensible of it. Whence then arise the dangers of slavery and its free discussion? Do 'well treated' persons ever become 'excited,' by the investigation of their 'good treatment?'

To page 104 add: that the charges of 'treason,' 'fanaticism,' &c. are not only scandalous, but criminal charges. Those therefore who make them are morally bound to prove them;—and it is sufficient evidence of their falsity, that no such proof is ever offered. Besides, all these false and scandalous charges, are direct breaches of the ninth commandment.

To page 110 annex the following paragraph. Most of the objects of political contention in this country, have been respecting the modes and degrees of the exercise, of some of the *minor* rights, and about their party distribution, among the white people; or, respecting the modes, degrees and party distribution, of public rights and measures; such as the Tariff, the Banks, the Public Deposites, &c.; all which have been deemed of the most vital importance to American liberty, and worthy of the most furious party strife and sacrifice. Very few however of these great objects of party strife, seriously affect the absolute rights of the partizans, their relations or friends. Yet it is deemed highly patriotic, democratic and republican, to contend zealously about them at the polls. But if the very *existence*, not merely of the minor rights and the modes of their exercise, but of the major or absolute rights, (of far more importance than all the rest,) of the millions of our slaves deprived of all rights whatever, be proposed to be vindicated at the polls, every epithet of abuse and reproach is heaped on the proposal, by men who lay claim, to the purest democracy and moral consistency! That is to say, they make the *distribution* of the lesser rights of white people, a matter of far greater political importance, than the *existence* of the greater rights of colored people; and then boast of being 'genuine good democrats!!' The modification and disposition of a few of the inferior rights of white people, are with them every thing; while the very existence of the rights and happiness of the coloured people, are nothing at all!!! And when tested by habitual conduct and practice (whatever it may be in pretence and theory,) this is all there is of 'American democracy and republicanism,' about which there is such endless complacency, swagger and cant among their professors; the only exception to this severe reproach, being the conduct of the abolitionists; they only practising the equal doctrines which all profess. Political Pharisees are as despicable as religious ones. And never was the 'mint, anise and cummin' doctrine

more shamefully exemplified, than by the constant habit of all political parties, of thus 'straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel,' in democratic republican America.

ERRATA.

On page 15 line 32 from bottom, for 35, 39, read 35–39,—line 22 from bottom, for 14, 39, and 15, 68, read 14–39, and 15–68. On page 24 line 3d from top, for 'slaves' read 'servants.' On page 72 line 10th from top, for 'neighboring' read 'labouring. On page 104 line 24 from top, for 'or' read 'of;' and on line 25 instead of 'of *by* the &c.' read 'of the &c.' There are a few other errata, principally in the references, which careful readers will correct for themselves.

Requests.

The holders of copies of this work, are requested to make their own indexes to it. This will be found to be a most useful exercise, to fix the various matters treated of firmly in the memory.

They are also requested to procure for the Lectures, readings in public assemblies, wherever they will be tolerated. And considering the subjects treated of, it is believed that no other objections will be made to such readings, but what will operate equally against the reading of other arguments, intended to establish the other doctrines of the christian religion.

For further information respecting the true nature of the Hebrew Servitudes, and the true meaning of those parts of the Scriptures perverted to justify Slavery, the reader is specially referred to the pamphlet entitled '*The Bible vs. Slavery*,' or, '*Weld's Bible Argument*,' written by T. D. Weld.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 002 081 155 9